A N

Argumentative and Practical

DISCOURSE

OF

Infant-Baptiſm.

IN WHICH

I. The Lawfulneſs of Infant-Baptiſm is Demonſtrated.

II. The Objections againſt Infant-Baptiſm are Anſwered.

III. The Uſefulneſs of the Ordinance is Aſſerted.

IV. The Sinfulneſs of Re-baptizing Manifeſted

V. The Non-neceſſity of Dipping Evidenced.

VI. The Practical Uſe of Infant-Baptiſm Urged and Inforced.

Quicunque Parvulos recentes ab uteris Matrum Baptizandos eſſe negat Anathema eſto. Concil. Milevit. Can. 2.

The Second Edition.

By William Burkitt *Rector of* Mildin *in* Suffolk, *for the Eſtabliſhment of his Pariſhioners.*

Licens'd, Mar. 1. 169½. *Z. Iſham.*

London, *Printed by* T. M. *for* Tho. Parkhurſt *at the* Bible *and* Three-Crowns *in* Cheapſide *near* Mercers-Chappel, 1695.

BIBLIOTHECA · BODLEIANA ·

The Occaſion of the Following Diſcourſe.

SINCE the late General Liberty, the Anabaptiſts *(thinking themſelves thereby let looſe upon us) have diſperſt themſelves into ſeveral Counties: Endeavouring to draw away our People from us; by perſwading them to Renounce their firſt Dedication to God in Baptiſm, and to enter into their Communion after the Way of Dipping.*

One of their Teaching Diſciples, having ſet up in our Neighbourhood for making Proſelites, by Re-baptizing them in a naſty Horſe-pond; into which the filth of the adjacent Stable occaſionally flows; and out of which his deluded Converts come forth with ſo much Mudd and Filthineſs upon them, that they rather reſembled Creatures ariſing out of the Bottomleſs Pit, than the Candidates of Holy Baptiſm, and all this before a promiſcuous Multitude in the face of the Sun.

My Spirit hereat was juſtly moved, (as I think every good mans ought to be) and I could not but paſſionately mourn, that ſuch a Sacred Inſtitution of our Bleſſed Saviour, and one of the moſt venerable Myſteries of our Religion ſhould be thus proſtituted and expoſed to publick contempt and ſcorn. Hereupon I apprehended it my obliged Duty, to warn the People of my Charge, of the Sin and Danger of theſe Principles and Practices: And accordingly in my Expoſition of our Church Catechiſm, treating of the Sacrament of Baptiſm; I proved the Lawfulneſs, and Aſſerted the Uſefulneſs of Infant-Baptiſm: And manifeſted the Sinfulneſs of Re-baptizing.

This ſo offended our Waterman, that he ſent me a Letter, charging me with delivering Scriptureleſs Doctrine, and deſiring that he might hear from me. Whereupon ſoon after I went to his Meeting-Place and before the People demanded the Juſtice of him to hear the doctrine, which unheard he had charged with falſhood, and then required him to make good his charge.

And the better to compoſe and prepare the minds of the Auditory, as alſo for obtaining a Bleſſing upon the Truths delivered: I began with humble Invocation, and calling upon Almighty God for his Influence and Aſſiſtance in the following Prayer.

The Prayer.

OH Eternal and Almighty God! Who ſheweſt to them that be in Error the Light of thy Truth, to the intent that they may return into the way of Righteouſneſs; we moſt Humbly beſeech Thee at this time to enlighten our Underſtandings ſavingly, in the Knowledge of thy Mind and Will, that we may be guided into all Truth neceſſary to our Salvation. Great is our natural Blindneſs and Ignorance, but Thou haſt promiſed that thy Word and thy Spirit ſhall never depart from us. May we then at all times be taught of God, and made wiſe unto Salvation: Thou ſitteſt in Heaven that teacheſt Hearts; who teacheth like God?

Aſſiſt, we pray Thee, thy Servant in the delivery of the preſent Meſſage: Singly to aim at thy Glory, and compaſſionately to endeavour the Right information of this Peoples Judgments, and to deſire the Salvation of their Immortal Souls: To that end, let thy Holy Spirit ſo influence their Minds and Wills, that they may hear thy Word without prejudice, that they may entertain thy Truths without partiality; that they may obey from the Heart the form of Doctrine delivered to them, how contradictory ſoever it may be to their Private Opinions, or ſecular Intereſts. All which we humbly beg, in the Name and Mediation of the Infinitely Worthy Jeſus: Who hath both directed and commanded us, when we pray, to ſay, *Our Father*, &c.

Theſe Two Books following by the ſame Author.

The Poor Man's Help, and Young Man's Guide; containing, 1. Doctrinal Inſtructions for the right Informing of his Judgment. 2. Practical Directions for the general Conrſe of his Life. 3. Particular Advices for the well managing of every Day: With Reference, to his I. Natural Actions, II. Civil Imployments, III. Neceſſary Recreations, IV. Religious Duties: Paricularly, 1. Prayer. Publick in the Congregation. Private in the Family. Secret in the Cloſet 2. Reading in the Holy Scriptures. 3. Hearing of the Word Preached. 4. Receiving of the Lords Supper. Unto which is added. An Earneſt Exhortation unto all Chriſtians to the Love and Practiſe of Univerſal Holineſs.

—— His Sermon at Mr. *Gurnal*'s Funeral: Both Printed for, and Sold by *Tho. Parkhurſt* at the *Bible* and *Three-Crowns* in *Cheap-ſide.*

The Subſtance of the following Diſcourſe was Delivered, under the enſuing Propoſitions.

At Lanham *in* Suffolk, 1691.

1. *Prop.* THat Baptiſm by Water is a Sacrament of the New Teſtament, Inſtituted by Jeſus Chriſt, for the ſolemn Admiſſion of the party Baptized into the Chriſtian Church; and to be a Sign and Seal unto him of the Covenant of Grace.

2. *Prop.* That not only thoſe who do actually profeſs Faith in Jeſus Chriſt; but the Infants of ſuch Profeſſors, may and ought to be Baptized.

3. *Prop.* That Baptiſm Adminiſtred to perſons in their Infancy, is much more uſeful and advantagious, than when omitted in Youth, and afterwards Adminiſtred in riper years.

4. *Prop.* That Baptiſm ought but once to be Adminiſtred to any Perſon; and ought not to be Re-iterated or Repeated.

5. *Prop.* That Dipping or Plunging of a Perſon into the Water, in the act of Baptizing, is not neceſſary; but Baptiſm is rightly Adminiſtred by pouring or ſprinkling Water upon the Perſon Baptized.

6. *Prop.* That the efficacy of Baptiſm is not tyed to that moment of time, wherein it is Adminiſtred; but it is a Chriſtians duty to make a daily improvement of his Baptiſmal Vow as an engagement to the Practice of Univerſal Holineſs.

As to the firſt of theſe Propoſitions, namely that Baptiſm by Water is an Ordinance of Chriſt ſtill in force; You of the *Anabaptiſts* perſwaſion and we are agreed:

And I know of none that call themſelves Chriſtians, who deny Water-Baptiſm to be an Ordinance of our Saviour, except the *Quakers*, who tell us, it was a Temporary diſpenſation: And ended with *John* the Baptiſt.

Many of theſe *Quakers* were once your *Proſelytes*, and here the Righteous Judgment of God upon them, ought with ſerioufneſs and ſadneſs of Spirit to be remark'd for, denying Infant-Baptiſm, they are given up to deny all Water-Baptiſm, and to decry all Goſpel-Ordinances: the whole of their Religion being little elſe than Freakiſhneſs and Enthuſiaſm.

The great Controverſie betwixt us and you lyes in the ſecond Propoſition; Touching the Subjects capable of Baptiſm: who the perſons are which may and ought to be Baptized. All ſuch as do Actually profeſs Faith in Chriſt, and Obedience to him, ſay you, and ſo ſay we too: But not only ſuch, for the Infants alſo of ſuch Profeſſors may and ought to be Baptized.

Therefore for the clearing and confirming of this Propoſition: I ſhall Firſt, propound to your Conſideration, ſeveral Arguments drawn from the Holy Scriptures for Infant Initiation, ſhewing the Infants right to the Seal of the Covenant, from their being in Covenant, and that by Vertue of this Right, the Primitive Church of Old, and all the Reformed Churches at this day did, and do admit Infants to Baptiſm. Secondly, I ſhall anſwer the Objections which the Oppoſers of Infant-Baptiſm do make againſt thoſe Arguments.

1. *Arg.* If the Infants of the *Jews* were partakers of Circumciſion; then the Infants of Chriſtians, may and ought to be partakers of Baptiſm.

But the Jewiſh Infants were partakers of Circumciſion: Therefore Chriſtian Infants may and ought to be partakers of Baptiſm.

If Baptiſm ſucceeds in the room of Circumciſion: Then as the Jewiſh Infants were Circumciſed; ſo the

Infants

nfants of Chriſtians may and ought to be Baptized: But Baptiſm ſucceeds in the room of Circumciſion. Therefore as their Children were Circumciſed then, ſo may ours be Baptized now.

If you deny that Baptiſm ſucceeds in the room of Circumciſion, I prove it by a double Argument.

1. If Baptiſm ſucceeds not in the room of Circumciſion; then either Circumciſion is not Aboliſhed, or elſe ſome other Ordinance ſucceeds in the room of Circumciſion. But to ſay that Circumciſion is not Aboliſhed, is Vertually to deny that Chriſt is come in the fleſh; and no other Ordinance is pretended to ſucceed in the room of Circumciſion. Therefore Baptiſm undoubtedly ſucceeds, or nothing ſucceeds in the room of Circumciſion.

2. Again, If Baptiſm ſignifies the ſame thing that Circumciſion did, and ſerves for the ſame end, for which Circumciſion was; then Baptiſm doth certainly ſucceed in the room of Circumciſion.

But Baptiſm now ſignifies the ſame thing to us which Circumciſion did to the *Jews* of old, and ſerves for the ſame end to us, which Circumciſion did to them; Therefore Baptiſm under the Goſpel ſucceeds Circumciſion under the Law, and conſequently as the Jewiſh Infants were Circumciſed, ſo may ours be Baptiſed.

That Baptiſm ſignifies the ſame thing that Circumciſion did, and is uſed for the ſame end for which Circumciſion was, will manifeſtly appear by the enſuing Parallel.

What did Circumciſion ſignifie but the Corruption of Humane Nature? It told the *Jews* that their Children brought ſomething into the World with them, which ought to be early cut off and caſt away. And what does Baptiſm now ſignifie but the impurity of our Natures which ſtand in need of the Blood of Jeſus Chriſt to purifie and cleanſe them, of which the Water in Baptiſm is a Sign?

And what was the end of Circumciſion? Was it not

the Sacrament of Initiation? Did not all Perſons enter at this door into the Jewiſh Church? And are not we by Baptiſm inducted into the Chriſtian Church?

Was not Circumciſion then, a diſcriminating Sign to diſtinguiſh the ſeed of *Abraham* from all other People under Heaven; and are not we by being Baptized now into the Name of Chriſt, diſtinguiſhed from all People in the World whatſoever. Did Circumciſion, then, comprehend Perſons of all Ages? Were Infants and Children ſolemnly Initiated as well as grown Men? Would not Almighty God have an Infant of eight days Old excluded then from Circumciſion for any Natural incapacity? In like manner has he no where declared that Infants of that Age ſhould be excluded now from Baptiſm, they being as capable of the viſible Sign of Gods inviſible favour now, as they were then. But to put the matter out of all diſpute, namely that Baptiſm doth ſucceed in the room of Circumciſion, take St. *Pauls* Teſtimony, *Col.* 2. 11, 12. *In whom alſo ye are Circumciſed with the Circumciſion made without hands, by the Circumciſion of Chriſt, Buryed with him in Baptiſm.* Obſerve here that the deſign of the Apoſtle is to take the *Coloſſians* off, from the old Sacramental Right of Circumciſion: He informs them that there was no reaſon why they ſhould be ſo fond of it, for they were compleat without it; becauſe Chriſt had Subſtituted a new Circumciſion in the room of it, as being more ſuitable to the Goſpel-State; namely Baptiſm, and accordingly Chriſtians may now be ſaid by Baptiſm to be ſpiritually Circumciſed, as the *Jews* of Old might be ſaid by Circumciſion to be ſpiritually Baptized.

Objection againſt this Argument.

There was, ſay the *Anabaptiſts*, an expreſs Command in ſo many Words for Circumciſion; But there is no ſuch expreſs Command for Infant-Baptiſm, *Gen.* 17. *v.* 9. requires Infants to be Circumciſed: But ſhew us a Text in all the New Teſtament that ſays, *let Infants be baptized*

1. To

1. To this Objection I return a threefold Anſwer, 1. I acknowledge, that the New-Teſtament, tho' it be not wholly ſilent: yet ſpeaks very little touching the caſe of Infants, and that, as I conceive, for theſe two Reaſons, 1. Becauſe the Old Teſtament ſpeaks ſo much in their caſe, therefore the New Teſtament ſpeaks ſo little; the Old Teſtament fully declares the mind of God, that not only Believers, but all their Seed ſhould be owned as his Covenant-ſervants. Thus in *Deut.* 29. 10, 12. *Ye ſtand here before the Lord this day, you and your little ones, to enter into Covenant with the Lord thy God.* The Old Teſtament plainly informs us, that Children in their Infancy were admitted members of the Viſible Church. Now what need is there that the ſame thing be repeated over again in the New-Teſtament, which is ſo frequently and fully aſſerted in the Old? For it is not the Old-Teſtament alone, nor the New-Teſtament alone, but both together, that contain the rule of Faith and Practice. For as much then, as one Teſtament doth ſo freely caſt its Light upon the other, we muſt take heed that we do not undervalue and reject an Old Teſtament Text, as no ways uſeful to clear and eſtabliſh a New Teſtament Truth. The *Jews* reject the New Teſtament, and the *Anabaptiſts* (in the caſe before us) ſinfully ſlight the Old; but without the help of both, we can never underſtand the mind of God in either. 2. So little is ſaid in the New-Teſtament about Baptizing Infants, becauſe the cuſtom of Baptizing them was common, and the Practice conſtant in the Jewiſh Church, at, and before our Saviours coming. Whilſt Circumciſion was the Covenanting Sign, Baptiſm was the purifying Ceremony among the *Jews*. For when any of the *Gentiles* were admitted into the Jewiſh Church, both Parents and Children were firſt Circumciſed, and then Waſh'd, in token of cleanſing them from the filth of their Heatheniſm; ſo that Baptiſm among the *Jews* con-

conſtantly went along with Circumſion in proſelyting the *Gentiles*, till our Saviours time. And when our Lord entred the Stage of his publick Miniſtry; he nulls and makes void the ſeverer Ordinance of Circumciſion, and ſubſtitutes Baptiſm, the ſofter and Milder Ordinance in its ſtead, as moſt ſuitable to the ſweetneſs and gentleneſs of the Goſpel-ſtate. This our Learned Divines, *Lightfoot*, *Taylor* and *Hammond*, have abundantly proved, out of the Jewiſh Writers, to the full ſatisfaction of ſuch as are capable of receiving it.

If now you ask, why our Saviour did not particularly Name Infants, when he Inſtituted Baptiſm in the room of Circumciſion; the Anſwer is, becauſe there was no occaſion for it. What need our Saviour declare that Infants ought to have the Seal of the Covenant applyed to them, when it was never denyed them? What need he bid them Inititate Infants, when'twas never otherwiſe? Indeed if Infants had never had the Seal of the covenant applyed to them before, it had been highly requiſite that our Saviour ſhould have particularly named them now: But being always included before, if our Saviour had intended their excluſion now, he would moſt certainly have declared it, which not being done, we may reaſonably conclude that the Admiſſion of Infants into the Chriſtian Church, is agreeable to our Saviours Will.

2. My ſecond Anſwer to this Objection, that Infants are no where in the New Teſtament Commanded (in ſo many words) to be Baptized, is this; Altho' they are not particularly named; yet are they neceſſarily included in the Commiſſion given for all Nations being Baptized, St. *Mat.* 28. *v.* 19. Infants being a very conſiderable part of all Nations: Surely the Univerſal, (all Nations) does include the individuals, tho' our Saviour does not particularly name them. To clear this to your underſtandings, let me make uſe of an Illuſtration. Suppoſe the King ſhould grant his Royal Charter to make this your Market-Town a Corporation, and all the Inhabitants

bitants of it Free-Men; would any be ſo idle as to ſuppoſe that this Royal Grant doth not include your Children, becauſe it doth not particularly name them? Is not the Son of a Free-Man, a Free-Man as well as his Father? Thus here in the Sacred Charter and Royal Pattent of the Covenant of Grace, which is Sealed by Baptiſm. All the Priviledges and Promiſes of that Covenant granted to Believers, concern their Children as well as themſelves, *Acts 2. v. 38. The promiſe is to you, and to your Children:* That is, the promiſe of the Covenant belongs to you and yours. The Infants then of Believing Chriſtians are included together with themſelves, tho' not particularly named.

3. To this your moſt popular Objection againſt Infant Baptiſm, from the ſilence of the Scripture in that caſe, I anſwer; That which by a juſt and neceſſary conſequence is deduced from Scripture, is as much the Mind of Chriſt, as what is contained in the expreſs Words of Scripture. The *Arians* of Old rejected conſequential Proofs, & required expreſs Words of Scripture only, hoping that way to ſecure and defend their Errors againſt the Arguments of the Orthodox. If you of the *Anabaptiſts* perſwaſion do the ſame, know, that if you deny evident and neceſſary conſequences from Scripture, [illegible]en, 1ſt. you deny your Saviours way of Arguing; [illegible] 2dly. you condemn your own practice.

1. If [illegible]n will not allow Scripture conſequences, you diſallow [illegible]r Saviours way of arguing: For how did he prove the Reſurrection againſt the *Sadduces*, St. *Mat.* 22. *v.* 31. but by a Scripture conſequence, *I am the God of A[illegible]raham, the God of* Iſaac, *and of* Jacob. Here ſeems but little in the Text to prove the Reſurrection, but there was much in the Argument, for thus our Saviour Argues: That to which Almighty God pronounceth himſelf a God, is alive, and has a true and real exiſtence. But Almighty God pronounceth himſelf a God to *Abraham, Iſaac,* and *Jacob*, many hundred years after

their

their Death, therefore they are yet alive, and have a real exiſtence.

2. Nay farther, if you deny Scripture-conſequences, you can never juſtifie many of your own practices; ſhew me an expreſs Command in Scripture for praying twice a day in your Families, for ſaying Grace before and after Meat, for Womens Receiving the Lords Supper, for changing the Sabbath. Shew me a Text (ſay) you that ſays remember to Baptize Infants: ſhew me a Text, (ſay I) that ſays remember to keep Holy the firſt day of the Week.

Will you ſay that Chriſt being Lord of the Sabbath, had power to change the Day? The ſame ſay I: Chriſt being Lord of his own Houſe has power to change the Seal of the Covenant from Circumciſion to Baptiſm; ſo for Womens Receiving the Lords Supper, will you ſay that they are included tho' not named, for all Chriſts Diſciples ought to partake of Chriſts Supper; But Women are his Diſciples; Therefore to partake of his Supper, and is not the Argument as ſtrong; All Chriſts Diſciples ought to be Baptized. But ſome Children are his Diſciples; Therefore to be Baptized: Children are his Diſciples, 1. By the Scriptures Denomination: *Acts* 15. *v.* 1. 8, 10. 2. By their Parents Dedication of them to Chriſt. 3. By their Parents Education of them for Chriſt. 4. By Chriſts gracious acceptation of them at their Parents hands, St. *Mark* 10. *v.* 13.

2. *Arg.* If the Infants of Believing Chriſtians under the Goſpel are in Covenant with God, as the Jewiſh Infants under the Law were; then the Seal of the Covenant, which is Baptiſm, may and ought to be applied to them.

But the Infants of Believers under the Goſpel are in Covenant with God, as well as the Jewiſh Infants under the Law were.

Therefore Baptiſm the Seal of the Covenant ought to be applyed to theſe, as Circumciſion was to them.

They who by Circumciſion were once ſolemnly taken

ken into Covenant with God, and never ſince were ſolemnly caſt out, do undoubtedly continue in a Covenant ſtate. But Infants under the Law, were ſolemnly by Gods appointment taken into Covenant with himſelf, and were never ſince by any command of God, caſt out: therefore they do ſtill continue in Covenant.

That Infants under the Law were by ſpecial appointment from God taken into Covenant with himſelf, is evident, from *Gen.* 17. 7. where God ſays thus to *Abraham*, *I will eſtabliſh my Covenant betwixt Me and Thee, and thy Seed after Thee in their Generations, to be a God unto Thee and to thy Seed:* Whence it evidently appears that under the Old-Teſtament Children were in Covenant with God, together with their Parents, and the New-Teſtament ſpeaks as plainly that they are ſtill in Covenant, *Act.* 2. 39. *The promiſe* (that is, the Promiſe of the Covenant) *is unto you and to your Seed.* The Apoſtle ſays not, the Promiſe was unto you and to your Seed, but is unto you and your Seed. Again, if Infants were in Covenant with God under the Law, but are now caſt out by Chriſt under the Goſpel, then theſe abſurdities follow:

1. Then Infants are in a worſe condition ſince the coming of Chriſt than they were before, and are loſers by him, inſtead of being gainers: And altho' the number of Infants ſince Chriſts coming, has been many thouſand times greater than before his coming; yet was their condition better under *Moſes* than under Chriſt, according to your Opinion.

2. Then the Priviledges of the Goſpel are ſtreighter and narrower than thoſe of the Law, which in the judgment of judicious *Calvin* is a degree of Blaſphemy to affirm, ſurely the deſign of our Saviours coming was not to confine the Church to narrower limits; and to curtail her Priviledges, but to extend and inlarge them; and accordingly the Scripture every where ſhews that the Priviledges of Chriſtians under the Goſpel, do infinitely excel theirs under the Law, not only in ſpirituality and livelineſs, but alſo in extent and largeneſs.

3 Far-

3. Farther yet, if it was the Will of God that Infants under the Goſpel ſhould be reckoned as out of his Covenant, who before were in Covenant with him, then it follows that our Saviour was forgetful or unfaithful to his Church, in that he never acquainted her with this Alteration. Can we reaſonably ſuppoſe that he would not have inform'd his Apoſtles, when he ſent them forth to gather a Church unto him out of all Nations; that it was his Fathers pleaſure, that Children ſhould not now be lookt upon as Church-members, altho they had ever been accounted ſo before. Doubtleſs Chriſt the great Prophet of his Church, would have revealed ſuch a conſiderable part of his Fathers will unto his Apoſtles, if it had been ſuch; but not one word by way of prohibition do we find in all the New Teſtament, from whence we may conclude that Chriſts not repealing the Practice of initiating Infants, nor forbidding their admiſſion into the Chriſtian Church by Baptiſm; is a ſufficient Demonſtration that it was his pleaſure, that they ſhould continue in their former condition of Church-membership; and conſequently be Baptized. Before I end this Argument, let me ſuggeſt one thing more to your Conſideration; namely, what a mighty ſtumbling-block this Doctrine of the *Anabaptiſts* lays in the way of the Jews Converſion to Chriſtianity; will this encourage a Jew to embrace the Religion of Jeſus, to tell him of the high and glorious Priviledges that he ſhall be intereſted in himſelf, upon his believing on him, but as for his Children they muſt be caſt out, and numbred with Heathens and Infidels; and accounted as uncapable of Baptiſm, the ſign and ſeal of the Covenant of Grace, as dogs and ſwine; let it be conſidered how this opinion would invincibly prejudice a Jewiſh parent againſt the embracing of Chriſtianity.

And how would this opinion alſo fill the mouths of Jewiſh Children, with clamorous & paſſionate complaints againſt Chriſtianity; as the moſt rigorous and unkind diſpenſation, for after this manner we may conceive the child

child of a Jew to expoſtulate his own condition. Alas! how ſad is my eſtate like to be, if my Father a Jew by nature becomes a Chriſtian by Profeſſion? He was at eight days old made a member of the Church by Circumciſion, his Infancy was no bar to render him uncapable of the Covenant-Bleſſing; but now if my Father becomes a Chriſtian, my condition as I am his child will be impaired, though his condition be improved; for a Chriſtian Child is found in a worſe condition than a Jews Child is left; Chriſtianity may indeed be a good Religion for men to die in; but ſurely Judaiſm was better for children to be born in, for it ſeems the Alteration of our condition, ſince the coming of the Meſſiah is much for the worſe.

In a word, all good men deſire and pray for the Jews Converſion, and I hope ſo do the *Anabaptiſts* alſo; but it is evident, that this their rigid opinion concerning the Infants of Chriſtian Parents, if duly conſidered, lays a mighty ſtumbling-block in the way of the Jews Converſion.

Objection againſt the ſecond Argument.

Now that which the *Anabaptiſts* object againſt the foregoing Argument for Baptizing Infants, drawn from their Covenant-ſtate, is this, namely, that the Covenant which God made with *Abraham*, *Gen.* 17. in which he promiſed to be a God to Him and his Seed: was not a Covenant of Grace, but of works only. A carnal covenant, promiſing carnal things only; as the Land of *Canaan*, and ſuch like temporal Bleſſings. To which Objection of theirs, I return a threefold reply.

1. I affirm, that the Covenant which God made with *Abraham*, *Gen.* 17. was moſt certainly a Covenant of Grace, as plainly appear to Me three ways. (1.) From the Language and Expreſſion of it. (2.) From the Duration and continuance of it. (3.) From the Bleſſings and Benefits conveyed by it.

Obſerve 1. The Language and Expreſſion of it, *Gen.* 17. 7. *I will be a God unto Thee, and to Thy Seed after Thee*: Now is not this a pure Goſpel-phraſe, and ſhews

it

it to be a Covenant made with *Abraham* in Chriſt; I pray! how comes Almighty God (who upon the breach of the Covenant of Works made with us in *Adam* became our enraged Enemy) to be a God unto fallen man, any other ways than by a Mediatour, who is Jeſus Chriſt, called the Angel of the Covenant; if then it was a Covenant made with *Abraham* in Chriſt, it muſt neceſſarily be a Covenant of Grace, for Almighty God was never in a Covenant of friendſhip with any man ſince the Fall but in and through Jeſus Chriſt; out of whom he is a conſuming-fire, but in him our Covenant-Friend and moſt graciouſly reconciled Father.

Obſerve 2. The Duration and continuance of this Covenant which Almighty God made with *Abraham*, the Lord calls it an Everlaſting Covenant, now the Covenant of Works which God made with *Adam* was but a ſhort-laſting Covenant. I am aware that the *Hebrew* word for Everlaſting, ſometimes in Scripture ſignifies no more than a long continuance of time; but when the Lord ſays, he will be a Perſons God Everlaſtingly, it denotes his being ſo to all Eternity: For whom the Lord loveth with a ſpecial Love, he loves unto the end and without End.

Obſerve 3. The Bleſſings and Benefits conveyed by this Covenant which God made with *Abraham* do prove it to be a Covenant of Grace: To be a God unto Him and His Seed, and that Everlaſtingly, is a moſt comprehenſive Goſpel-Bleſſing; for hereby God gives a Perſon an Intereſt in all that he is, and in all that he has, ſo far as can be communicated to a Creature. This Bleſſing promiſed to *Abraham* comprehends Chriſt, Grace and Holineſs here; Glory and Happineſs hereafter: and accordingly we find the Apoſtle, *Hebrews 8th.* uſes the ſame Expreſſion with this of Gods to *Abraham*, *I will be to them a God, and they ſhall be to me a People.*

2. I anſwer, that the Covenant which God makes with Believers now under the Goſpel, is the very ſame for ſubſtance with that which he made with *Abraham* under the Old

Old Teſtament, for *Abraham* is ſtill the Father of the faithful, and the Believing *Gentiles* under the Goſpel are as much his Seed in Gods account as the *Jews* were under the Law; it is true, that the Adminiſtration of the Covenant is different now from what it was in *Abrahams* time; but the Covenant it ſelf is the ſame, for obſerve, there never were but two ways of Life to Mankind; the one before the fall by perfect doing; the other ſince the fall by ſincere Believing and Obeying. Anſwerably hereunto, there can be but two Covenants betwixt God and Man; the Covenant of Works made with us in *Adam*; and the Covenant of Grace made with us in Chriſt, the laſt of theſe has paſt under various Adminiſtrations, according to the different ages of the Church, in *Abrahams* and the *Iſraelites* time it was more obſcurely Adminiſtred; under the Goſpel it is more conſpicuouſly and clearly manifeſted, but ſtill the Covenant for Subſtance then and now the ſame; when therefore the Apoſtle in his Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, calls ours a better Covenant, than the *Jews* were under, he means not for Subſtance, but for Clearneſs.

In a word, if the Covenant which God made with *Abraham* be a Covenant of Works (as the *Anabaptiſts* affirm) how comes Circumciſion, the Seal of that Covenant, to be called *a Seal of the Righteouſneſs of Faith*, Rom. 4. 11. the Righteouſneſs of Faith and Works being oppoſite.

3. I reply, that if the Covenant which God made with *Abraham* of old, and with us now, be one and the ſame Covenant of Grace; then our Infant-ſeed have a right to Baptiſm, the preſent Seal of the Covenant, as the ſeed of *Abraham* had a right to Circumciſion the Seal of the Covenant of old; if Infants Church-Membership then was no abſurdity, it can be none now; if Children were in Covenant with God in *Abrahams* day, they are ſo at this day, unleſs we find that Almighty God has any where excluded them from his Grace and Favour; which doth not appear, but rather the contrary; for many Scriptures ſpeak of the enlarging of our Priviledges, under

this last and best Administration of the Covenant of Grace. If then Almighty God under the Old Testament vouchsafed it as a gracious privilege unto Infants, to be incorporated with their Parents, and to be accounted members of his Church; they must be declared capable of the same privilege still, without an express prohibition from God himself to the contrary.

To sum up all then, that I judge needful to say upon this Argument; if the Covenant which God made with *Abraham* and his Seed, was a Covenant of Grace (as I hope clearly appears to you) and if the Covenant which God makes with us under the Gospel, be for substance the same with that which he made with *Abraham* of old; and if the Seal of the Covenant then, which was Circumcision, was applied by Gods appointment to all his Infant-seed; then by the same parity of Reason Baptism, which is the present Seal of the Covenant of Grace, ought to be applied to Infants now, unless Almighty God has declared his pleasure to the contrary, which no where appears.

Arg. 3. If Infants are capable of spiritual Benefit by Baptism, then Baptism may and ought to be administred to Infants; if they are capable of the inward and invisible Grace, surely they may partake of the outward and Visible Sign: If the Word of the Promise doth belong to them, surely the Seal of the Promise ought not to be with-held from them.

But the former is true, namely, that Infants are capable of Benefit by Baptism: Therefore the latter is true also, they ought to be Baptized.

There are amongst others, Two special Blessings and spiritual Benefits, which Infants are capable of by Baptism; namely, the Remission of their Sins, and the Regeneration of their Natures.

1. Remission of Sin: This being an Act of gratuitous favour in God, discharging a Person from his obnoxiousness to Wrath, upon the score of guilt contracted.

An

An Infant is certainly as capable of this Act of Favour as a grown man, tho for the preſent he doth not underſtand either the worth or the want of it. Is not the Infant-Son of a Traitor as capable of Benefit, by the Kings gracious pardon, as the Father himſelf; an Illuſtration will make it plain to you. Suppoſe the King ſhould ſend for a Traitors Child out of the Cradle, and before all his Courtiers declare, that whereas the Blood of that Child was attainted by its Fathers Treaſon, and therefore according to Law its whole Inheritance became forfeited to the Crown; yet, ſays the King, I will pardon this Infants freely, and reſtore him to all his forfeited Rights, & in token thereof I Command one of my Miniſters to waſh the Infant with pure water: Signifying thereby to all my Subjects that he is cleanſed from his Original Attainder and Corruption of Blood, and that I am perfectly reconciled to him.

I demand now, whether any one can truly ſay that this Action was inſignificant to the Child, becauſe he did not underſtand it; or will any ſay that the Child was uncapable of waſhing, which was the ſign, when it was capable of being acquitted from its Attainder, which was the thing ſignified thereby; if then Infants are capable of Remiſſion of Sin, ſurely they are capable of Baptiſm, the Token of Remiſſion, which is the great Truth that this Illuſtration was brought to prove. But farther,

2. Infants while ſuch, are no leſs capable of the Regeneration of their Natures, than they are of the Remiſſion of their Sins, it being certain that no unclean thing can enter into Heaven, that none can be ſaved whoſe natures are not renewed; either the ſanctifying Grace of God muſt be allowed Infants, or Salvation muſt be denied them. Regenerating-Grace is called by St. *John* the Seed of God, 1 *Ep. ch.* 3. 9. Now, what hinders, but that the Soul of an Infant, may be as capable of this ſeed, as of a grown Perſon. For thus I argue:

If the Image of God, conſiſting in Holineſs; was re-

ceived by the Soul in the first Creation, without the Souls contribution to the production of it; why may not the same Image of God be restored to the Soul in the new Creation, without the Souls Concurrence and Co-operation to the Restitution of it? for why may not the Spirit of God produce in an Infant that imperfect Regeneration, whereof we are now speaking; as well as he did that more perfect Holiness in which our first Parents were Originally Created?

What an high affront then, do those men give to the Omnipotency of the Holy Spirit, who affirm that it is a vain a thing, to hope and pray that Almighty God should Regenerate an Infant with his Holy Spirit; as to expect that he should illuminate a Stone or a Tree.

But if Infants are found capable subjects of regenerating grace and remission of sin (as I hope appears) Then surely they are capable of Baptism, for the outward and visible sign ought not to be denied to such as are capable of the inward and spiritual grace.

Objection against the third Argument.

But, say the opposers of Infant Baptism, Infants are by a natural incapacity rendred uncapable of any spiritual benefit by baptism: Therefore Baby-Baptism (as they scornfully call the Ordinance) is sinful in the Administration, and folly in the Administrator.

I Answer: This is the highest Arrogancy imaginable to make your selves wiser than God; will you say Almighty God acted foolishly in commanding *Isaac* to be circumcised, when he was under as natural an incapacity to answer the end of Circumcision, as our Children are to apprehend the reason of baptism; who do you not then call it a Baby-Circumcision. Verily if your Argument has any force, it rises up against Infant-Circumcision as well as against Infant-Baptism; because Circumcision was instituted for the same end that Baptism is: And the person circumcised was under the same natural incapacity with the Person Baptized. Neither one, nor the other un-

ſtood what was done unto them, the Jewiſh Infants only felt the pain of the Circumciſing Knife, as our Infants feel the coldneſs of the Baptiſmal-water, but neither of them were capable of underſtanding the ſignificancy of the Ordinance. I am aware of the frivolous Objection, which you make to evade the force of this Argument, by ſaying that Circumciſion was more proper for Children than Baptiſm: becauſe it left an indelible Character upon the child, and imprinted a ſignificant mark upon its fleſh which did not wear out: whereas baptiſm is a Tranſient ſign, and leaves no mark upon the Forehead of the Baptized Child.

But there is no force at all in this Objection, becauſe tho' Circumciſion did leave a mark upon the Childs fleſh, yet the circumciſed Child did not underſtand what that mark ſignified till it was grown up and inſtructed by the Parent, no more than the baptized child knows the reaſon of its baptiſmal waſhing till the parent acquaints it with the myſtery of it. So that the caſe is the very ſame. What does baptiſm (ſay you) avail before the Infant is capable of underſtanding the Nature, uſe and end of it? What did the mark imprinted on the Childrens fleſh in Circumciſion (ſay I) profit them, before the Parent inſtructed them, that it was the Token of Gods Covenant with them? So that according to your way of reaſoning, Circumciſion and Baptiſm ought both to have been deferr'd till years of diſcretion: which, as I hinted before, is to make your ſelves wiſer than God, who knows better than you, when to time the Application of his own Ordinances.

But let us hear your Reaſons, why Infants are altogether uncapable of benefit by baptiſm.

Becauſe ſay you, (1.) they want actual Faith and Repentance, (2.) Becauſe they are not capable of Miniſterial Teaching.

1. You Object, that Children have not actual faith, and conſequently cannot make a viſible Profeſſion of their

Believing in Christ, which is the condition required in order to Baptism; *He that Believeth and is Baptized shall be Saved*, &c. St. *Mark* 16. 16.

I Answer, that a Profession of actual Faith is necessarily required before Baptism in all Adult-persons, that is, Persons grown to riper years, who are the Persons whom our Saviour meant, when he said, *He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved*; as most evidently appears by the following words, *He that believeth not shall be damned*. What? must all that die in their infancy, go to Hell for an impossibility? The Text only intends such as by hearing the Gospel preached are capable of actual Faith; such as injoy the means of Faith, and yet live and die in the neglect of Faith, and contempt of Baptism, shall certainly be damned. 2 *Thess.* 3. 10. Says the Apostle, *If any man will not work, let him not eat*; that is, such as are capable of working must work, but must Children be starved, because they cannot labour? Thus here, Children lie under a natural incapacity of professing actual Faith, therefore the first Text does not concern them, any more than the latter.

Obj. But say you, because Children are uncapable of Knowledge and Faith at present, therefore ought they not to be baptized at present.

I Reply, Children are capable of present Benefit by Baptism, tho' they do not at present understand and believe, to make it plain to you by a familiar Comparison: Suppose there was a great Plague in this your Town, and Almighty God should miraculously call eleven or twelve Men, and communicate to them a Medicine against the Plague, and bid them teach you the Inhabitants the Vertues of this Medicine: Assuring you, that he that believeth and taketh the Remedy shall live, but he that believeth and receiveth it not shall die.

I demand, whither according to the Mind of God gathered from the Words of this Commission, the Remedy prescribed should be administred only to grown Persons

sons, because they only are capable of understanding, and believing the Vertue and Efficacy of it; certainly every rational man among you would conclude his Child capable of the Remedy as well as himself, altho' ignorant of the Vertue that is in it, and only passive in the administration of it; and that it would be cruelty, yea murther in the Parent to deny the Application of it to all his Children.

2. I Answer, that tho' Children have not actual, yet they have habitual Faith; Faith *in Semine*, and so are potentially Believers, as for instance, Infants have not the use of Reason, yet because they have the principle of Reason, we call them reasonable Creatures, the first day they are born. Thus Infants whilest such, have not the use and exercise of Faith, but they have it in the Root, tho' not in the Fruit, and so may be called Believers initially.

Add to this, that Infants being born within the bosom of the Church of believing Parents, the Faith of the Parent is to them (at present) instead of an outward profession in their own Persons; and thus they have *Fidem Fœderis*, tho' not *Fidem Fœderatorum*; as the Learned *Paideaux* speaks, for tho' no Child is saveable by its Parents Faith, yet the Child of a Believer is Baptizable by vertue of its Parents Faith; because the Parent receives the Promise of God both for himself and for his Seed, *Act.* 2. 39. & why may not Children be stiled Believers with respect to their Parents Faith, as well as they are stiled Saints (ἅγια) with respect to their Parents Profession, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14.

2. Your 2d. Objection against my 3d. Argument, is this: Infants are not capable of Ministerial Teaching; therefore not of Baptismal Washing; because Teaching must go before Baptizing, according to the order of the Words in our Saviours Commission, St. *Matth.* 28. *v.* 19. *Go Teach and Baptize all Nations.*

1. I answer, it is a mighty weakness to infer from the Order of the words, the necessary order of things. St. *Matthew* sets Teaching before Baptizing, but St. *Mark*

Mark sets baptizing before teaching, *Ch.* 1. *v.* 4. So that no concluſive Argument can be drawn from thence either way. But,

2. Obſerve the true Reaſon why Chriſt bid his Diſciples firſt Teach and then Baptize, becauſe he was now ſending his Apoſtles forth amongſt the Heathen, to convert them to Chriſtianity; In which Work we all know that the Preaching of the Word muſt go before the Adminiſtration of the Sacraments. Should the King of *England* ſend his Miniſters into Foreign Plantations, to convert the *Indians* to Chriſtianity; They ought not to be Baptized before they are taught and inſtructed, but when the Parents are Proſelyted and make a Viſible Profeſſion of their Faith, their Children may be Baptized, and afterwards inſtructed, as the Children of the Jewiſh *Proſelytes* were firſt Circumciſed, and then Taught; for tho' *Abraham* was firſt Taught, and then Circumciſed, yet *Iſaac* was firſt Circumciſed, and then taught. So that the ſence of our Saviour is this: Teach ſuch as are capable of Teaching, and Baptize ſuch as are capable of Baptiſm.

I will illuſtrate the matter to you by a plain ſimilitude. Suppoſe a Perſon, owner of a great Flock of Sheep, ſhould Command his Shepherd, to ſhear all his Sheep, and give them an Ear-mark to know them by, ſhould the Shepherd ſhear the Sheep, and only mark them, and leave out all the Lambs, (which perhaps made up half the fold) unmark'd, can the Shepherd be ſuppos'd to have done his duty? Suppoſe he ſays, the Lambs were very young, and uncapable of Shearing; true, ſays the Owner, but were they not capable of marking?

Infants, ſay you, are not capable of Teaching; but are they not capable of Chriſts Ear-mark, (Baptiſm) by which Chriſts ſheep are diſtinguiſhed from the Devils goats? But, according to your principles, Chriſts fold has no Lambs in it, but all ſheep; ſuch a fold as the World never yet heard of. See *Iſa.* 40. *v.* 11.

1. *Arg.* If Infants be capable of Chriſts bleſſing on Earth, and of his preſence in Heaven: if they be ſubjects of his Kingdom of Grace, and heirs of his Kingdom of Glory; then, they have an undoubted Right to the priviledge of Subjects, amongſt which Baptiſm the Seal of the Covenant is not the leaſt.

Or take the Argument thus.

Thoſe whom Chriſt invites to him, and are received by him, his Miniſters may not refuſe, nor put from them. But Infants are by Chriſt invited to him, and when ſuch, received by him: Therefore the Miniſters of Chriſt, may not, ought not, durſt not refuſe to receive them into communion with them. Again, if there be no other ordinary way of coming to Chriſt now, but by Admiſſion into the Church of Chriſt: Then the Miniſters of the Church ought not to exclude thoſe whom Chriſt invites: But there is no other ordinary way now of coming to Chriſt, but by Admiſſion into the Church of Chriſt: Therefore none muſt be excluded whom Jeſus Chriſt has graciouſly invited.

For the proof of this Argument, I appeal to the Words of our Saviour himſelf, St. *Mark* 10. 13. *Suffer little Children to come unto me, for of ſuch is the Kingdom of Heaven.* That is, my Kingdom of Grace, my Church on Earth, and my Kingdom of Glory in Heaven conſiſts of Sucking Children, (ſo the Original word ſignifies) as well as grown Perſons. From whence I thus Argue: Does Chriſt take Children into his Arms: and ſhall his Church caſt them out of her embrace?

Does Chriſt own them for Subjects of his Kingdom, and ſhall we allow them no better ſtanding than in the Devils Kingdom?

Does the ſpirit of Chriſt call the Infant-ſeed of Believers, Holy: and ſhall we prophanely call them common and unclean, like the ſeed of Infidels and unbelieving Pagans?

Shall we allow them no other Priviledge by being

Born

born of Christian Parents, than what the Children of Turks and Infidels do enjoy?

Can any Wise or good Man believe that our Saviour would speak such favourable words of Infants, and by his outward gesture manifest so much good will towards them, only with an intent to insnare and deceive us; Doubtless it was to encourage his Ministers and Ambassadors to perform all Charitable offices towards them: and pursuant to such encouragement I will much rather choose to answer my Lord and Saviour at the great Day for admitting hundreds of Infants of Pious Parents into his Church by Baptism, than for keeping one out: For if Christ denies them not the Kingdom of Heaven, which is the greater, what reason have I to deny them Baptism, which is the less? Therefore, as *Calvin* very well observes upon the place, 'tis no less than audacious Sacriledg in the Ministers of Christ to drive them from his Sheep-fold, which he so Lovingly owns to be a part of his Flock. And altho' I do, and even desire, to bear a Loving and Charitable mind towards the Persons of the *Anabaptists*, yet can I not be reconciled to their unkind and uncharitable Opinion, which robs Parents of their Comfort, Infants of their Right, the Church of its Members, and God of his Glory.

Objections against the fourth Argument.

1. *Obj.* Say you, We read that Christ blessed these Children, but we find not that he baptized them.

Answ. Our Saviour baptized not any himself, therefore no wonder that he did not Baptize Infants; but his praying for them, his blessing of them, and declaring that the Kingdom of Heaven belongs to them, was a great deal more than if he had baptized them: besides being capable of Christs blessing, they were capable also of baptism, being purely passive in both; and if these Children were not Baptized now, yet they had now an unquestionable Right to Baptism.

2. *Obj.* But we do not read that ever the Disciples Baptized these Children afterwards. *Answ.*

Answ. Perhaps they were baptized before: but if not, does it follow that the Apostles did not baptize these Children because we have no mention of it? The Scripture no where tells us that the Apostles themselves were baptized; shall we therefore conclude that they were never baptized?

3. *Obj.* But say you, if Infants have a right to baptism, because Christ says, *Of such is the Kingdom of Heaven*; Then it follows as well that they have a Right to the Lords Supper, and ought to be Communicated as well as Baptized.

Answ. There is not the same reason, because, 1. Almighty God requires a particular qualification to fit a Person for the Lords Supper, which Infants are not capable of. Namely the exercise of actual Grace in self-examination, in discerning the Lords Body, and remembring the Death of Christ. 2. The different nature of the Sacraments, hints to us a special difference in this case, for Baptism being a Sacrament of Initiation, or admission into the Visible Church, Persons of all Ages are capable of it; but the Lords Supper being a Sacrament of Confirmation, and the means of our Spiritual growth in Christ, requires some standing in the Church, and strength of stomack, and so is the proper Ordinance for grown Christians. And accordingly you may observe, that altho' the Jewish Infants at eight days Old were capable of Circumcision: yet their Children never were admitted to the Passover before they were able to go up to the Temple, to enquire about the meaning, and understand the reason of that service. In like manner when our Children are Old enough to understand the Nature of the Lords Supper, and are capable of performing the Duties required in order to a worthy participation of the Ordinance, they may then be admitted to it: but not before.

5. *Arg.* If the Infants of Christian Parents are federally Holy, then are they Subjects qualified for Baptism.

But the Scripture pronounces ſuch Children federally Holy: therefore they are qualified for Baptiſm, and may be admitted to it.

See two Texts of Scripture for the proof of this Argument.

1. Text, *Rom.* 11. 16. *If the Root be Holy, the Branches are alſo Holy*; where by the Root we are to underſtand the Old Teſtament Saints, *Abraham*, *Iſaac*, and *Jacob*, and by the Branches their Poſterity the People of the *Jews*. This Root is ſaid to be Holy in regard of the Promiſe, which was made to them and their Seed.

Now foraſmuch, as the *Jews* the Natural Branches are for unbelief broken off, and the believing *Gentiles* are graſted in their ſtead, and ſucceed in their Priviledges in the ſenſe that they were Holy, ſo are we, namely, not with an internal and inherent Holineſs, paſſing by natural Generation from Parent to Child, but with an External, Relative, Covenant-Holineſs, grounded on the Promiſe made to the Faithful and their Seed.

2. Text is, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. *The unbelieving Wife is Sanctified by the believing Husband*, &c. *elſe were your Children unclean, but now are they Holy.*

Which words, are St. *Pauls* anſwer to the *Corinthians* ſcruple; whether ſuch as had Heathen and Infidel Wives, ought not to put them away with their Children, as in the days of *Ezra*; the Apoſtle reſolves them, that they ought not; for (ſays he) the Unbelieving Wife is ſanctified to the Believing Husband; how ſanctified? Not in her Nature, but in her Uſe. So as that they might lawfully Cohabite and converſe together; and for your Children they are Holy, not with an Inherent, Internal Perſonal Holineſs, for the Holieſt man-Child is born in Sin, and by Nature a Child of Wrath: But with an External, Relative, Federal Holineſs, they are not common and unclean, like the Children of Infidels; but fit to be partakers of the Priviledges of the Church, and of being admitted by Baptiſm into the Church, which the Children of Infidels are not.

Objecti-

Objection againſt the Fifth Argument.

That which the Oppoſers of Infant Baptiſm Object againſt this Argument is this; that the Apoſtle in 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. intends a Matrimonial Holineſs, your Children are Holy, that is, ſay they, they are Legitimate & not Baſtards. To which I Anſwer, that this is not an interpreting, but a Racking of the Scriptures, to maintain a private opinion; it is to make the Scripture ſpeak what you think, and not what the Apoſtle intends; for according to this interpretation of the word Holy; the Apoſtle ſpake neither pertinently nor truly.

1. Not pertinently; for his Anſwer had been nothing to the purpoſe; the Caſe put was concerning Husbands and Wives, not concerning Men and Whores; and the Queſtion propounded was not, Whether the *Corinthians* were lawful Man and Wife, (no body doubted that;) but whether the Chriſtian Husband might put away his Heathen-Wife. The Apoſtle anſwers, that he ought not, if ſhe were willing to continue and dwell with him; for ſays he, the Wife, tho' an unbelieving Heathen is ſanctified to her Chriſtian Husband; not ſanctified in reſpect of her perſonal condition, but in reſpect of her conjugal Relation; for tho' ſhe be unclean in the ſight of God, yet is ſhe ſanctified in a way of Marriage to her Believing Husband; *Becauſe to the pure all things are pure*; otherwiſe (ſays the Apoſtle) your Children would be unclean, as the Children of Heathens are, but now are they Holy, that is, to be accounted viſible Saints, till they profeſs the contrary; & as ſuch to be admitted to Church-priviledges.

2. According to this interpretation of the word (Holy) the Apoſtle had not ſpoken truly; for the Children of Heathens born in lawful Wedlock are no more Baſtards, than the Children of Chriſtians, their Parents Marriage frees them ſurely from the charge of illegitimacy, as well as others.

Add to this, that in all the New-Teſtament, the word (Holy) tho' it be uſed above five hundred times, yet never

ver signifies Legitimacy, but is always used for a state of separation to God: take one Instance instead of many, St. *Paul* in the Inscriptions of his Epistles directs (τοῖς Ἁγίοις) *To the Saints or Holy ones*, at Rome *and* Corinth, &c. Now according to these mens Interpretation of the Word (Saints) the Apostles meaning should be this, to all that are not Bastards and unlawfully Begotten at *Rome* and *Corinth*, &c. unless they will say, that the word Saint, when applied to grown Men does signifie Holy, but when applied to Children, must signifie Legitimate; but here they are extreamly out in their Logick, for every Fresh-man can tell them, that *magis & minus non variant speciem*. I must say therefore, that forasmuch as the word (Holy) in all other places in the New-Testament, doth signifie Dedication or Separation to an Holy use: to make it in this place (*viz.* 1 *Cor.* 7. 14.) to signifie Legitimation, is a bold practising upon the Scriptures; and men instead of bringing their Opinions to the touchstone of the Scriptures, do wrest and rack the Scriptures to favour their Opinions.

6. *Arg.* That which has been the constant and Immemorial Practice of the Church of God in all Ages of the World, is unquestionably an Ordinance of God, and agreeable to his Will. But Infant-initiation, or the Admission of Infants into the Jewish Church by Circumcision, and into the Christian Church by Baptism, has been the immemorial Practice of the Universal Church from the days of *Abraham* to this day. Therefore it is undeniably an Ordinance of God, and agreeable to his will.

That Infants under the Old Testament were admitted into the Jewish Church by Circumcision; none will deny, and that Infants also under the New-Testament were entered into the Christian Church by Baptism: Appears to me very plain, (1.) From the command of our Saviour. (2.) From the Practice of the Apostles. (3.) From the constant usage of the Primitive Church after the Apostles.

1. That

1. That Infants were to be admitted into the Chriſtian Church, appears from our Saviours expreſs Command in the words of the Commiſſion: St. *Matth.* 28. *v.* 19. *Go Diſciple all Nations, Baptizing them.* That is, go and Proſelyte all the *Gentile* Nations, without any Diſtinction of Country, Sex, or Age whatſoever, make the Goſpel Church as large as you can. Doubtleſs had our Saviour here intended the excluſion of Infants out of the Viſible Church, which had all along been included, this faithfulneſs to his Church would have oblig'd him to acquaint her with this alteration, Chriſt being faithful to him that appointed him, as *Moſes* was faithful in all his Houſe, *Hebr.* 3. *v.* 2.

2. Baptizing Infants appears in the Chriſtian Church from the practice of the Apoſtles, who Baptized whole Families; *Lydia* and her houſhold, *Acts* 16. 15. the *Jaylour* & all his, *Acts* 16. 33. How reaſonable is it to believe that there were Children in thoſe Families as parts of the houſhold, for the word houſe and houſhold in Scripture ſignifies Children eminently, *Pſal.* 127. 1. hence it is obſervable that the ſame word in *Hebrew* ſignifies a Son and an houſe: Becauſe Children (under God) do build up the houſe and keep up the name of their Fathers Family, and accordingly the Apoſtle directing a Biſhop to rule his Houſe well, preſently names Children as the moſt conſiderable part of his charge and care, 1 *Tim.* 3. 4.

Obj. 1. But ſay you, we do not find that *Lydia* had any Children, therefore (the Scripture being ſilent) we may as well ſuppoſe that *Lydia* had no Children, as you ſuppoſe that ſhe had.

Anſw. Neither doth the Scripture name any Husband that *Lydia* had, or any Servant in her Houſe, nor any of her Kindred or acquaintance that were with her: So that your argument runs thus. The Scripture mentions no Children in *Lydia*'s Houſe when ſhe was Baptized, therefore *Lydia* had no Children; Thus then will I argue; The Scripture mentioneth neither Husband, nor

Child-

Child, nor Servant, nor Kins-folk, nor friend, nor Neighbour, in *Lydia*'s House. Therefore there was none: So then, *Lydia* and her House was Baptized, that is, *Lydia* and her self.

Obj. 2. But you will say, suppose *Lydia* had Children and the Jaylor also, how does it appear that they were now Baptized, and not afterwards, when they came to Riper years?

Answ. The Text says, they and theirs were baptized straight-way, which implies strongly that their baptism was not delayed, but presently performed: nor do we any where read that either *Lydia*'s or the *Jaylors* Children were Baptized afterwards.

Search the Scriptures, and produce me one instance if you can, from the time of St. *John* the *Baptist* to the Death of St. *John* the *Evangelist*, which was more than threescore years; during which time many thousands of Infants were grown up to maturity, and make it appear that they were not Baptized in their Infancy, or that their Baptism was deferr'd till Riper years, or that there is any Divine Command for the delaying the Baptism of the Children of Christian Parents, until they are grown up: and I will frankly yield the cause.

3. We meet with early mention of the baptizing of Infants in the Primitive Church after the Apostles, so early that none could ever yet define or declare when the practice began: which shews it to be Apostolical: and accordingly the Churches practice in baptizing Infants, altho' it has been disputed by particular persons, yet was never censur'd, much less condemned by any Regular Society or Body of Christians since the Apostles days.

He that desires to see a cloud of Witnesses out of Antiquity, for the Practice of Baptizing Infants in the Primitive Church, may consult the Learned *Vossius* in his Historical *Theses de Baptismo*, to his ample satisfaction. It may be sufficient for this Auditory that I only produce the Testimony of two very antient Fathers, St.

Irenæus

Irenæus and St. *Cyprian*, who lived very near the Apoſtles times, and therefore may be ſuppoſed very well to underſtand the practice of the Apoſtles.

1. The former ſpeaks thus; *Omnes venit Chriſtus per ſemetipſum ſalvare, omnes qui per eum renaſcuntur ad Deum, Infantes & Parvulos Juniores & Seniores.* St. *Iren, lib.* 11. *cap.* 39. That is, *Jeſus Chriſt came to ſave all by himſelf, all, I ſay, who by him are born again unto God, Infants and little ones, young and Old:* By Infants being born again unto God muſt be underſtood, either their being born of Water, or their being born of the Spirit; if their being born of Water be intended, then it is plain they were Baptized; if it be underſtood of their being born of the Spirit, then it follows that they were capable of being born of Water, that is, of being Baptized, for ſuch as are capable of the thing ſignified, are certainly capable of the ſign.

2. The ſecond Authority is that of St. *Cyprian* in his Epiſtle to *Fidus, ep.* 58. *Fidus* a *Presbyter* had Written to St. *Cyprian* his Biſhop to deſire his Judgment about Baptizing Infants before the eighth Day: the queſtion was not about the Lawfulneſs of Baptizing them, but about the circumſtance of time, whether before the eighth day, according to the uſage in Circumciſion; St. *Cyprian* returns him this anſwer, *That both himſelf and the Council with him, which conſiſted of* 66. *Biſhops*, had unanimouſly determined, *that a Child might be Baptized as ſoon as it was born.* Adding theſe words, *Nulli hominum Nato, miſericordiam & gratiam Dei denegandam eſſe*, that is, the mercy and Grace of God, (diſpenſed by Baptiſm) is to be denyed to no Child of Man, namely upon the account of its Age. After which, another Council, that at *Milevis*, *decreed thus*: *Quicunque parvulos recentes ab uteris matrum Baptizandos eſſe negat, Anathema ſit:* he that denys Infants to be Baptized as ſoon as they come out of their Mothers Womb, let him be an *Anathema*. But that I may fully ſatisfie

you my Auditors (few of whom are capable of ſearching Antiquity) inſtead of further Teſtimonies from the Ancients, I will produce four Arguments, which to me are convincing Demonſtrations, that Children in the Primitive times were Baptized in their Infancy.

1. *Demonſt.* If Children in the Primitive times were confirm'd in their Minority, then they were undoubtedly Baptized in their Infancy: But the former is true: Therefore the latter.

That Confirmation was an Apoſtolical practice the Scripture plainly intimates, *Hebr.* 6. *v.* 2. The Doctrine of Baptiſm and of laying on of hands, &c. *Hic locus ad pædobaptiſmi Approbationem facit*, ſays *Calvin.* This place (ſays he) makes for Infant Baptiſm, and how does it make for it, but thus? If perſons were Confirm'd in their minority (that is, as ſoon as they were capable of giving account of their faith, to the Church) then they were Baptized in their Infancy.

Queſt. But what was this Practice of Confirmation, ſay you, is it not Antichriſtian, & does it not ſmell of Popery?

Anſw. Altho' the Church of *Rome* has corrupted and abuſed it, by making it a Sacrament, and in ſome reſpects Superiour to Baptiſm, yet is this no juſt diſparagement of it, for if we conſider Confirmation in its Primitive Purity and Practice, it will appear a very uſeful Ordinance in the Church of Chriſt.

The Original of it thus:

In the Primitive Church there were two ſorts of *Catechumeni*; that is, Perſons Catechized and Inſtructed in the Chriſtian Religion; the firſt were (*extranei*) that is, perſons without the pale of the Viſible Church, *Heathens* and *Infidels* by birth: Now theſe were firſt Taught, and then Baptized; firſt inſtructed in the faith, and afterwards Baptized into that Holy Faith they were inſtructed; in the ſecond ſort were *Conſœderati*, that is, the Children of believing Parents, who being born within the Viſible Church, were look'd upon as members of it:

it: and Baptiſed in their Infancy. Theſe being unable to make a confeſſion of their Faith before Baptiſm, as they grew up, they were Catechiſed and Inſtructed in the Faith, which they had in their Infancy been Baptiſed into. And when they were able to give an account of their Faith, they came into the publick Congregation, and made an open Confeſſion of it before the Church. Ratifying by their own voluntary conſent, that Covenant which they had entred into with Almighty God at their Baptiſm, and taking that promiſe upon themſelves which their Sureties had made on their behalf when they were Baptized. And thus by Prayer and impoſition of Hands they were received *in Eccleſiam Adultorum*, and ſo were admitted to the Lords Supper; and thus by a regular Tranſition they paſt out of a ſtate of Infant memberſhip into a ſtate of Adult Memberſhip, by a perſonal owning of their Baptiſmal Covenant.

Now the uſefulneſs of Confirmation, according to its firſt Inſtitution and Primitive Practice will appear many wayes.

1. By this means, that much neglected and deſpiſed Ordinance of Catechiſing would be brought into more frequent uſe, and greater eſteem in the Church.

2. Hereby Parents would be excited, and Children quickned to ſeek after knowledge, that they may be able to give an account of that Faith, which they are Baptized into.

3. By this means a Soveraign remedy would be provided againſt the malady of mixt Communions: ignorant and ſcandalous perſons would hereby be kept from Communion with the Church in that Venerable Ordinance of the Lords Supper.

2. *Demonſt.* If Children in their Infancy in the Primitive times were admitted to the Lords Supper, then they were certainly fore-admitted to Baptiſm, for no ſort of Chriſtians ever admitted any Un-baptized perſons knowingly to the Lords Table. But we find in the

Writings of the Ancient Fathers, particularly St. *Cyprian* and St. *Auguſtin*, ſeveral Pleas for Childrens receiving the Lords Supper, amongſt which one of the chief was grounded on St. *John* 6. 53. *Except ye eat the Fleſh and drink the Blood of the Son of Man, ye have no Life in you.*

I know the oppoſers of Infant Baptiſm will reply, that this was an erroneous Opinion and Practice; and I do not pretend to juſtifie it. But doubtleſs the Practice of Infant Communion may confirm any reaſonable Man in the belief of the practice of Infant Baptiſm, becauſe none could be Communicated before they were Baptized.

And therefore the practiſe of giving the Sacrament to Infants, which was in uſe of Old, (and as I have read is ſtill in uſe in the Greek Church at this day) is a moſt Emphatical Demonſtration that thoſe Churches were, and are of Opinion, that Infant Baptiſm is as Lawful and Valid as that of Perſons of riper years.

3. *Demonſt.* If the Ancient Fathers brought the Baptizing of Infants as an argument againſt Hereticks, to prove the Doctrine of Original Sin, then certainly the Practice of Infant Baptiſm was anciently in the Church.

But we find the great St. *Auguſtine*, *&c.* in their Diſputations againſt *Pelagius*, (who boldly of Old, as many of the *Anabaptiſts* do at this day, denied the Doctrine of Original Sin) producing the Baptiſm of Infants as an Argument to prove them born in Sin.

Therefore there muſt be ſuch a Practice in the Primitive Church as Baptizing Infants, acknowledged. This *Pelagius* was an Heretick about the year 400. born in *Brittain* on the ſame day on which St. *Auſtin* was born in *Africa*. (Providence ſo ordering it, that the Poyſon and the Antidote ſhould be Twins in reſpect of Time.) Amongſt other of his Hereſies this was one, That Infants were born without Original Sin: St. *Auſtin* demanded of him the reaſon why the Church did then Baptize Infants, for, ſays he, what is clean already, needs not to

Now

Now thus I argue, if Infant Baptiſm was not an Apoſtolical Tradition, or were derivable from any thing leſs than Apoſtolical practice, how came it to paſs that the *Pelagians* did not reject it for an Innovation, when it was urged as an Argument againſt them: It had been eaſie for them (if there had been any grounds for it) to have denyed the practice of Baptizing Infants: or to have ſhewn that it was brought in by the falſe Apoſtles. But the *Pelagians* were ſo far from doing this, that they Baptized Infants themſelves, and owned that tho' it was not neceſſary for Remiſſion of Original Sin, (becauſe as they thought Infants had none) yet they adjudg'd it needful for Childrens obtaining the Kingdom of Heaven, and accordingly did Baptize them.

4. *Demonſt.* If it was a groſs Error in the Primitive Church, to admit Infants to Baptiſm; then the Primitive Fathers in ſuffering ſuch an Error to paſs uncenſured and uncondemned were guilty of the greateſt impiety and Hypocriſie. For what was this but to connive at a Mock-Baptiſm, and to make many Millions of Mock-Chriſtians? We find the Ancient Fathers ſmartly Writing againſt other Hereſies, that had crept in, in their days, as the Hereſie of the *Gnoſticks*, *Marcionites* and *Manichees:* but not one word againſt the Error of Infant Baptiſm, and yet we are fully aſſured that it was in uſe in their time.

And can we imagine that the Holy Ghoſt ſhould not preſerve one Church amongſt ſo many, from falling into ſuch a pernicious Error; but ſuffer the Univerſal Church for 1600 years together to perſiſt and continue in a ſinful Practice, if indeed it were ſuch, for not only the Primitive Church in the firſt Centuries, but all the Reformed Churches in theſe laſt Ages, and at this day, do in all their Confeſſions of Faith declare their belief of the Doctrine of Infant Baptiſm, and do practiſe accordingly.

1. The Church of *England Art.* 27. ſays thus: The

Baptiſm of young Children, is in any wiſe to be Retained in the Church, as moſt agreeable with the inſtitution of Chriſt.

2. The French-Church ſpeaks thus: Infants that are born of Holy Parents, ought to be Baptized by Chriſt's Authority.

3. The Dutch Confeſſion thus: We believe that Children ought to be Baptized under the Goſpel, as they were Circumciſed under the Law; for as much as the ſame promiſes were made to them, and to us.

4. The Church of *Bohemiah* ſays, Children ought to be dedicated to Chriſt, *&c.* according to his Command, *Mark* 10. 13.

5. The Church of *Helvetia* ſays, We Condemn the Doctrine of the *Anabaptiſts*, which deny Baptiſm to the Children of Believers, who are in Covenant with God, *&c.*

With many more to be ſeen in *Corp. Confeſ. Fid. Eccl. Ref.*

Now if the *Anabaptiſts* can believe, that Almighty God has ſuffered all his Churches, Ancient and Modern, and that in all parts of the World, to fall into one and the ſame Church-deſtroying Practice: They have a Power which I ſhall never envy them, namely, of Believing what they pleaſe.

Having thus (Satisfactorily, I hope) Evidenced to you the lawfulneſs of Infant Baptiſm: I proceed now to the ſecond part of my Province, to Manifeſt the uſefulneſs of that Ordinance in general, and to Demonſtrate that it is much more uſeful to Baptize a perſon in Infancy, than when grown to years of Underſtanding. Infant-Baptiſm, ſay the Anabaptiſts, is unlawful, becauſe it is unuſeful: Children, ſay they, underſtand no more than Brute Beaſts, what is done unto them: Therefore you may as warrantably Baptize a Beaſt, as a Child. Here therefore I ſhall endeavour theſe two Points. (1.) Aſſert the uſefulneſs of Infant-Baptiſm in General: And then (2.) Prove,

(2.) Prove, that it is much more Uſeful and Advantageous to Baptize a Child in its Infancy, than to omit it until grown to years of Underſtanding.

1. I ſhall Aſſert and Prove the Uſefulneſs of Infant-Baptiſm in General, that it is of mighty Advantage to Infants theſe three ways: (1.) As it is an Act of Initiation: (2.) As it is an Act of Dedication: (3.) As it is an Act of Reſtipulation.

1. Infant-baptiſm is greatly Advantageous, as it is an Act of Initiation, that is, a Solemn Admiſſion of the party Baptized into the Viſible Church: It is an Ordinance by which Babes are Matriculated and Adopted into the Houſe of their Father, and taken into the Arms of their Mother: Hence Baptiſm is called by the Ancients, *Eccleſiæ janua, gratiæ porta*, the Gate of the Church, and the Door of Grace: And for that Reaſon, they had their *Baptiſteria*, their Fonts or places for Baptiſm erected near the entrance, and not far from the Door of the Church: Now this Admiſſion into the Church being an Act of Favour and Divine Indulgence, Children as well as grown Men are capable of it. As for Inſtance: Suppoſe a Prince ſhould take a Beggars Child, and Adopt him into his Family, and ſettle a part of his Dominions upon him, and to Solemnize and confirm this, ſhould command the Child to be Waſhed with pure Water, who durſt deny the Child to be capable of this Act of Favour, and of Advantage by it? In like manner our Children now being as capable as the Jewiſh Children heretofore of the Sacrament of Admiſſion into the Viſible Church, by Vertue of their Admiſſion, you do entitle them to many choice Priviledges, and Special Advantages.

For, 1. Infants by being Members of the Viſible Church, are intereſted in all the Prayers that are daily put up, in and for the Church: For though the Church by the common Tye of Humanity Prays for all Mankind, yet thoſe that are of her own Flock and Fold, have a ſpecial intereſt in her daily Supplications. Although

there is not a Treasury of Merits, yet there is a Stock of Prayers continually going in, and for the Church, in which the Infant Seed of Believers, as well as others, have a particular share: Now if you will fully neglect to admit them by Baptism into the Church, her Charity towards them, and Prayers for them, can extend no farther to them, than to Heathens and Infidels.

2. Infants by Virtue of their Admission into the Christian Church, have an Interest in that special providential care which Christ Exercises over his Church. Although Christ exercises a general care over the whole Creation; Yet he is in a more peculiar manner the Keeper of his Israel; his Eye is upon every Member of his Church, Night and Day, and Infants no less than others, are under the Over-shadowing Wings of his Care.

3. Infants admitted by Baptism into the Visible Church, do stand nearer than the rest of Mankind to the promises of God: the Churches Children have a special promise of being taught of God, *Isai.* 54. 13. *All thy Children shall be taught of God, and great shall be the peace of thy Children:* Whose Children are these? but the Children of the Gospel Church. Now the least Member of the Gospel Church is a more Special Object of those promises, than any Person that is without, can be supposed to be.

Infant Baptism then is Advantageous, as it is an Act of Initiation, or Admission into the Church.

2. As it is an Act of Dedication, it is farther Advantageous: The Parent in Baptism Consecrates his Child to the Service of its Rightful Lord and Master.

Infants it's certain may be now presented unto the Lord as well as the First-born were presented unto him of old; and if they may be, they must be, and the sooner the better. Your Children are Gods already by Vertue of his choice, let them be also his, by Vertue of your Consecration.

Dedicate them to God in Baptism, and say; Lord, here is thy Child and mine; mine by Nature, thine by

Covenant.

Covenant. I here preſent him to Thee, let him be accepted by Thee: Oh! Make him thine by Grace, and by Adoption, as well as by a Fœderal Relation. Thou giveſt him the outward Sign, Oh! Do not deny him the inward Grace.

3. And farther, Baptiſm Adminiſtred in Infancy, is, greatly Advantageous, as it is an Act of Reſtipulation, that is, the Child at Baptiſm, enters into Covenant with God, takes (as it were) Chriſts Preſs-money in its hand, and its Name is entred into the Muſter-Roll of the great Captain of our Salvation, the Child takes an Oath of Fidelity to him, and obliges it ſelf to fight Chriſts Battels againſt Sin, the World and the Devil.

Now I demand, can your Children begin too ſoon to enter their proteſtation againſt theſe Spiritual Enemies of their Salvation? can they too early engage themſelves to God, by obliging themſelves to become his Covenant Servants?

Obj. But ſay you, Infants are not capable of making this Engagement in their own Perſons; how can they enter into Covenant with God, who know not that God is, or who he is?

Anſ. This Objection tyes as ſtrongly againſt Infant-Circumciſion, as againſt Infant-Baptiſm, yet obſerve, that Almighty God was pleaſed to Seal the Covenant of Old to the Jewiſh Children, upon an Implicit and Imputative Stipulation; which at years of underſtanding, they were bound to own, by openly profeſſing the Jewiſh Religion; an Implicit Stipulation was ſufficient for the Children of Believers, Then, although an open profeſſion and Stipulation was Required of grown Perſons. In like manner, Baptiſm being Ordained for Perſons of different ages, for perſons under, as well as at years of Diſcretion, perſonal and expreſs Covenanting is required of the former: But as for Children, Baptiſm may be Adminiſtred to them, upon an Implicite and Vicarious Reſtipulation, by their Sponſors or Sureties, of whom *Tertullian* ſpeaks,

(*de*

(*de Baptiſmo cap.* 18.) as a practice in uſe in the primitive Church, that the Sponſors did Stipulate in the name of the Minors, when they were Baptized: And I cannot underſtand what good Reaſon can be ſhewn, why Infants under the New Teſtament, ſhould not Covenant with God, by an Implicit and Vicarious Stipulation, as well as the Jewiſh Infants did under the Old Teſtament.

Having thus ſhewn the Benefit and Advantage of Infant-Baptiſm in general: I ſhall next prove to you, that it is much more uſeful and beneficial, to Baptize a Child in its Infancy, than to omit it till riper Years.

1. Becauſe no Infant-Member is capable of Hypocriſie, which perſons grown up, are too much guilty of: I do not ſay that Infants are a pure part of Mankind; but I may ſay, they are the pureſt part thereof, wholly uncapable of that groſs Hypocriſie which is too often found amongſt your Adult Proſelytes, according to your own Confeſſions; which tell us (in your Books) of Droſs and Chaff, and Canaanites in your Congregations, (and we have great reaſon to believe, that therein you ſpeak Truth.) Children (ſay you) fall away, and turn prophane, and practically deny their Baptiſm: Therefore let them not be Baptized, and how many Apoſtates have you had amongſt your ſelves (witneſs the great number of *Quakers*, which are falln from you, and deny all Water Baptiſm:) Therefore for ſhame make not this Objection, till you know Gods Secrets, and Mens Hearts.

2. Baptiſm Adminiſtred in Infancy, is far more Advantageous, than at riper years, as it is a præ-engagement upon the Chriſtian, to Repel and Reſiſt the Temptations of Satan: What a forcible Argument has a young perſon from his early Dedication to God in Baptiſm, to reſiſt the motions of Sin, and to repel the power of Temptation: And accordingly, *Luther* tells us of a young Virgin that reſiſted an Enticement to Uncleanneſs, with this Anſwer; *Baptizata Sum*, I am a Baptized perſon; What! ſhall I be reconciled to Sin, may the Soul ſay, unto

unto which I was a Sworn Enemy from my Mothers Breaſt? But now with what Armour ſhall the Unbaptized young perſon, blunt the edge of Satans Temptations? Come along with me (ſays Satan) and Liſt your ſelf under my Banner, for you are under no Explicit Engagement to the contrary; you cannot pretend that the Oath of God is upon you. Tis true, may the Devil ſay, you lye under a natural Obligation to ſerve and obey your Maker, as he is the Author of your being; but you do not lye under that Super-added Obligation of a Baptiſmal Vow, which others throw in my Teeth, when at any time I Sollicit them to comply with my Deſires. Oh then, let Parents early entitle God to their Children, that ſo they may prevent the Devils claim, bring them, under this Soul-engaging Ordinance of Baptiſm, and as ſoon as they are capable, cauſe them to underſtand the Obligation of that Engagement, as you love your Childrens Souls, let them not go grazing in the Wild Common of the World, without Chriſts Sheep-mark upon them, leſt Satan challenge them for his own, and clap his brand upon them.

3. Baptiſm in Infancy is more Advantageous, than at riper years, as it is an early Remedy againſt the Malady of Original Sin, that Hereditary Contagion of the Soul: Let me ask you, which is beſt for your Child that has the Kings Evil from its Birth, to be touched for it in the Cradle, or to let the Diſtemper Reign upon the Child till it is grown up, and can be ſenſible of the Benefit. Original Sin, it is ſuch an Evil, as none but the King of Heaven can Heal or Cure, and ſuch is his Compaſſion and Condeſcenſion, that he not only permits, but invites you to bring your Children to him, that he may touch them, St. *Mark* 10. 13. Now what way is there but by Baptiſm, to bring your Infants under Chriſts healing Hand, they are capable of benefit by no other Ordinance but this: Therefore will it be not only unkindneſs, but cruelty, yea, a De-

gree

gree of Soul Murther in you; to deny your Children the benefit of the Baptismal Laver.

4. Baptism early administred has this special Advantage, that it puts the Christian more bitterly upon mourning for actual Sin; from the Consideration of that shameful Perjury and wilful Apostacy that is found in such a Persons sin, who was by Baptism solemnly dedicated to God, and devoted to his Service and Glory. For thus may we suppose the early Baptized Christian to expostulate with himself, upon a due reflexion on his personal miscarriages: Ah! Wretch that I am! did God enter me into his Family in my Infancy? did he ever since treat me as his Covenant Friend and Servant? and was I no sooner able to speak, but I blasphemed him; no sooner able to go, but I ran away from him? how have all the Blood and Spirits that ran thro my youthful veins, boiled up against him? Oh how have I contrary to the Duty of my natural and sworn Allegeance, entered into a Covenant with Satan, and into a Confederacy with my imperious Lusts? Oh! my Soul, remember from whence thou art falln, and repent, renew thy Covenant with God, lest by more rivetted Apostacies thou provokest him to make thee a tremendous example to all revolting Backsliders.

But now an unbaptized Person has no such Consideration, from which to aggravate the Sins of his Youth; he never having engaged himself to God, nor any for him, by a Sacramental tye; and consequently looks upon himself as free, and discharged from any such engagement and obligation.

5. Baptism administred in Infancy has this singular Advantage, above that which is administred at riper years; that it gives the pious Parent a good ground of hope, that his Children dying in their Infancy are certainly saved; for his Child being within the Covenant, and having the Seal of the Covenant (Baptism) Applied to it, God makes that Ordinance at once a channel of Grace to the Child, and a Conduit of Comfort to the Parent; and accordingly

Christi-

Chriſtian Parents may comfort themſelves with the hopes of their Childrens Salvation, as *David* comforted himſelf at the death of his Child, 1 *Sam.* 12. 23. *I ſhall go to him, but he ſhall not return to me.*

Obj. But, ſay you, *David* means the Grave, the place of the Dead; and not the Kngdom of Heaven.

Anſ. Doth he ſo? how comes he then to comfort himſelf with that Conſideration? Surely it had been cold comfort to *David*, to think that he ſhould one day lye by his Child in the grave. Doubtleſs he hoped to meet his young Child in Heaven, and that expectation was the ground of his ſupport; and his Childs being in Covenant with God was the ground of that expectation. Now I appeal to you whether the well-grounded hope that a Parent has of his Childs happineſs, dying under the Seal of the Covenant be not a mighty ſupport to his ſorrowful Spirit, which the carleſs neglecters and wilful contemners of the Ordinance of God cannot have; all the ſupport ſuch can have is from the abſolute Mercy and Sovereign Pleaſure of Almighty God; ſuch a ground of Comfort, as a *Turk*, or an *Infidel* that knows not any thing of God, may have to ſupport them in the like Condition.

6. The Practice of Baptizing in Infancy appears to be moſt beneficial and advantageous; becauſe it prevents ſuch ſhameful and ſcandalous neglects of Baptiſm, and delays in the adminiſtration, as would moſt certainly ariſe in the Church, to the great blemiſh of Chriſtianity. Verily were Perſons wholly left to themſelves when they would come to that Ordinance, there being ſuch an averſneſs in mans Nature to ſo ſtrict and ſpiritual an Engagement; we ſhould certainly meet with as much difficulty to bring perſons to Baptiſm, as we do to perſwade them to come to the Lords Supper. They would need the ſame preſſing importunity to prevail with them to be Baptized, were it not done in their Minority; which now we are forced to uſe with them to perſwade them to be communicated.

Oh how many sorry shifts, frivolous excuses, and pitiful pretences should we have from them for delaying their Baptism? Some out of an unwillingness to forsake the pleasures of Sin, others plead want of sufficient Knowledge, others multitude of business, and many would stick at their own unworthiness: Therefore supposing the bare lawfulness of Infant Baptism, the Wisdom of the Church in all Ages is greatly to be approved, which has appointed the early Administration of Baptism, to prevent the scandalous neglect of such a sacred Institution of our Saviour. Baptism in Infancy having been proved not only lawful, but more advantageous and useful than when administred at riper years, and being a Sacrament of admission into the visible Church: it necessarily follows that it ought but once to be administred to any Person: and therefore when Persons have been rightly Baptized in Infancy, to Re-baptize, or Baptize them over again at riper years, (as the *Anabaptists* do) is sinful in them that undertake it, and no less sinful in any of you that submit unto it.

Here therefore I shall undertake these two Points.

1. I will endeavour to satisfie you, that such of you as were baptiz'd in Infancy, were *lawfully* & *rightly* baptiz'd.

2. That you having been once duly and rightly Baptized, ought not to be Baptized over again; and cannot submit unto such a needless Repetition of the Ordinance without Sin.

1. I affirm, that those of you who were Baptized in our Communion during your Infancy, were lawfully and rightly Baptized. This appears by an Enumeration of the several requisites, necessary to denominate a Person lawfully Baptized: all which did concur and were found in your Baptism. (1.) The Person Baptizing ought to be a lawful Minister, Authorized and Commissioned by Christ, and the Governours of his Church, for the right administration of the Word and Sacraments. (2.) The party Baptized must be a Subject qualified for Baptism; which the fore-

foregoing diſcourſe has proved Infants to be. (3.) The Element made uſe of muſt be Water; the Application of which to the Body being a lively reſemblance of the Application of Chriſts Blood to the Soul, for the waſhing away both the guilt and filth of Sin. (4.) It ought to be done before credible Witneſſes that may atteſt the Childs Admiſſion into the Chriſtian Church, as amongſt the Jews certain Regiſters or written genealogies were found in which the names of the circumciſed Perſons were recorded. See *Ezra* 2. 62. *Neh.* 7. 64. and accordingly the practice of the Chriſtian Church has been in all Ages to Baptize in the face of the Congregation, publickly owning thereby the party Baptized for a Member of the Viſible Church of Chriſt.

Laſtly, Baptiſm ought to be adminiſtred in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt, by an humble Invocation upon God in Prayer for a Bleſſing upon the Ordinance; and with ſuitable Exhortation and Advice to thoſe that preſent the Child to Baptiſm to take care that it be brought up in the Chriſtian Faith, which it is Baptiz'd into.

Now if Baptiſm thus adminiſtred be lawful and regular, I may according to the Judgment of Charity pronounce you that are here preſent rightly Baptized, all the eſſential requiſites being found in your Baptiſm. Therefore my next undertaking ſhall be to convince you, that to renounce your firſt Dedication to God, to diſown your former Baptiſm, and to ſubmit your ſelves to the Re-baptizers Dipping, is a very hainous and ſcandalous Sin.

And that I may fully convince you of the greatneſs of this Abomination; I ſhall offer a ſix-fold Argument to your Conſideration.

1. *Arg.* If Baptiſm ſucceeds in the room of Circumciſion; then Baptiſm is, as Circumciſion was, but once to be adminiſtred.

But that Baptiſm ſucceeds in the room of Circumciſion, I hope my firſt Argument for the lawfulneſs of Infant

Baptiſm

Baptiſm has fully ſatisfied you; therefore as Circumciſion was but once Adminiſtred, no more ought Baptiſm.

The reaſon for both is the ſame, becauſe as Circumciſion was the Sacrament of Initiation, and the door of admiſſion into the Viſible Church, ſo is Baptiſm; when Perſons are admitted members of a Society, they enter their Names but once for all.

Obj. I know ſome of you object, That the Lord commanded *Joſhua* ch. 5. *v.* 2. *To circumciſe the Children of Iſrael the ſecond time.*

Anſ. But you do not conſider that they were not the ſame Perſons; but the Children of thoſe Perſons that were circumciſed, for the Caſe was this: Circumciſion being omitted for forty years in the Wilderneſs, when the *Iſraelites* came to *Canaan*, the Lord requires *Joſhua* to revive that Ordinance; not to repeat it upon the Parents, but to revive it upon their Children; See *ch.* 5. 7. *And their Children Joſhua circumciſed, becauſe they had not been circumciſed by the way.* As Circumciſion therefore was not to be Reiterated then, no more ought Baptiſm to be Repeated now.

2. *Arg.* That Practice, which is inconſiſtent with the Nature and end of Baptiſm, is certainly ſinful. But to Baptize over again thoſe who were once rightly Baptized, is inconſiſtent with the Nature and end of Baptiſm. Therefore is the Practice ſinful. What is Baptiſm, but the Sacrament of our New birth? Now as we can be born but once in the Fleſh, ſo but once in the Spirit. 'Tis the Sacrament of our Inſition or Implantation into Chriſt. *Regeneratio ſpiritualis una eſt*, ſays St. *Auſtin*, *Sicut generatio carnalis eſt una.* But why may not Baptiſm be Repeated as well as the Lords Supper? Becauſe that is a Sacrament for our ſpiritual growth, this for our ſpiritual birth; a Perſon is born but once, but fed often. *Semel naſcimur, ſæpius paſcimur.* Beſides, every time we come to the Lords Supper, altho' we do not make a new Covenant with God, yet we renew our old One, which is much better.

3. *Arg.*

3. *Arg.* That uſe of a Sacrament, for which there is no command nor example in the Holy Scriptures, neither expreſly, nor by juſt and neceſſary conſequence is ſinful. But for Re-baptizing ſuch as were once rightly Baptized, we have neither Scripture-precept, nor Scripture-preſident, directly or conſequently. Therefore the Practice of baptizing over again ſuch as have been formerly Baptized, is certainly ſinful. Indeed in the Inſtitution of the Lords Supper, we find (*a Quotieſcunque*) as oft as ye do this, mentioned, which implies a command to do it often; but no ſuch Word of command relating to Baptiſm, to do that oftner than once; and accordingly amongſt the many thouſands that we read of who were Baptized in the Apoſtles days, we find not any that were Baptized twice over. Altho ſome of them had Apoſtatiz'd from the Faith they were Baptiz'd into, yet upon their Repentance they were received into the Churches Communion without being Re-Baptized.

4. *Arg.* That which is a perverting of the Ordinance of God, and a prophane taking of his Holy Name in vain muſt needs be ſinful. But thus cauſleſly to reiterate Baptiſm, and Baptize over again thoſe who were once rightly Baptized, is a prophanation of the Ordinance, and a taking of Gods Name in vain, therefore ſinful. Sacraments are the ſacred Inſtitutions of our Bleſſed Saviour, and the moſt venerable Myſteries of our Religion, and ought to be treated by all Perſons, with the greateſt ſolemnity and reſpect; now to repeat them without juſt cauſe, and a fit occaſion is to trifle with them; and to take the tremendous Name of God in vain in the uſe of them.

5. *Arg.* Sacrilegiouſly to renounce our firſt Dedication to God, and to give Satan the higheſt advantage againſt us, that He can deſire, muſt certainly be ſinful in the higheſt degree.

But for a Perſon to diſown his Baptiſm, is ſacrilegiouſly to renounce his firſt Dedication to God, to renounce his former Relation to Chriſt, and does give Satan an un-

ſpeakable advantage againſt a perſon. Therefore in the higheſt degree ſinful. Our Dedication to God in Baptiſm, is a Dedication for ever; ſo that to renounce that, is to renounce our Relation to Gods Family, to renounce our ſtanding in Chriſts Kingdom, to cut off our ſelves from that Body of which Chriſt is the Head, and in effect to renounce Chriſtianity it ſelf.

And as to that Power and Advantage, which it gives the Devil over a Perſon, I need ſay but this: That ſeveral of thoſe vile People called Witches, who have made a formal Covenant and expreſs contract with the Devil, have declared; that the firſt thing which Satan has required of them, was to renounce their Baptiſm, before which he could get no Power over them; and after which they had no power to reſiſt or withſtand him.

6. *Arg.* If the Church has held it ſinful to Baptize ſuch Perſons over again, who had the eſſentials of Baptiſm, tho' Baptized by Hereticks: Then is it much more ſinful to Re-baptize ſuch as are rightly Baptized by lawful Miniſters. But the Church has all along refuſed to Baptize them over again, who were at firſt Baptiz'd by Hereticks; if the Ordnance for the ſubſtance of it were rightly Adminiſtred to them. Therefore much leſs ought Perſons, who are already rightly Baptized by the true Miniſters of Chriſt, to ſubmit to be Baptized over again, nor can they ſubmit unto it without Sin.

It was a concluded Caſe in the Primitive Church, that where Baptiſm is rightly adminiſtred by a due Application of the Word and Water, tho' by an Heretick, yet it is certainly valid and good; and accordingly the Church appointed that ſuch Baptized Perſons ſhould be Catechiſed and Inſtructed in the Faith they were Baptized into; and ſo by Prayers and Impoſition of Hands were received into Communion with the Church; but were never Re-baptized. Nay further, this was not only the opinion and practice of the Primitive Church of old, but it is alſo the judgment and practice of the reformed Churches

at this day: For if a Perſon be Baptized by a Romiſh Prieſt, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt, and with the Element of Water, if afterwards this Perſon comes into the Proteſtant Communion, the Reformed Churches will not Baptize him over again: but exhort him and oblige him to make a right uſe of that Baptiſm which was (for Subſtance) rightly Adminiſtred to him: tho' in an undue manner.

What a high degree of Cenſoriouſneſs and uncharitableneſs then is it, in you of the *Anabaptiſts* perſuaſion, to condemn the Baptiſm of all the Reformed Churches throughout the World as Nul and Void, to pronounce it not an Irregularity only, but a Nullity alſo: Affirming boldly as you have now done at this preſent Conference, that there is no true Baptiſm, no true Church but amongſt your ſelves: which was exactly the Opinion of the *Donatiſts* in the days of St. *Auſtin*: who affirmed then, as you do now, that Almighty God had no Church, no Ordinances, no People but amongſt them, who were a poor handful of deluded Mortals, in a corner of *Africa*.

Therefore for a cloſe of this Argument concerning the ſinfulneſs of Re-baptizing; Allow me I pray you, liberty in the Name of my great Maſter, and for the Honour of his Holy Inſtitutions, which have been ſo ſhamefully proſtituted by ſome of you lately in our Neighbourhood, to expoſtulate the caſe with ſuch of you as have ſubmitted to be Baptized over again. Sirs, I beſeech you ſeriouſly to conſider both the Sin committed againſt God, and the ſcandal given to good Men; by renouncing your former Baptiſm, you have renounced your firſt Dedication to God, your former Relation to Chriſt: you have diſown'd that ever you were Members of his Body: You have profaned a Solemn Ordinance of God, and taken his Holy Name in vain, you have Condemned all the Reformed Churches throughout the World, who decry this practice of yours as an Abomination: Conſider I beſeech you, how you have fallen, and repent.

Alſo for the publick ſcandal you have lately given to all ſober Chriſtians, you ought to be greatly humbled: partly from the place it ſelf in which you have been Re-baptized, a filthy Pond in which Horſes tumble, and Swine wallow, partly from the conſideration of that Scorn and Contempt which was caſt upon a pretended Ordinance of God by the promiſcuous Multitude, who beheld this Action of yours with diſdain and deriſion. God grant your repentance may be as publick as your offence, and the ſcandal given by your offence. And for ſuch of you whom God has yet kept from this ſinful practice, my advice is, as you love your Souls, and value your inward peace, avoid the ſnare, ſhun all occaſions, come not near the Tents of theſe Men. Know that you are already in the Communion of a Church, which is a ſafe way to Salvation, and remember whenever you leave us, the farther you go, the worſe you'l ſpeed.

I know what your Dipper here will reply to all this, that he is againſt Re-baptizing alſo, and therefore to perſuade you to come under his hands, he will tell you, that he calls you to Baptiſm, not to be Re-baptized, you being (as he inſinuates) never Baptized at all, becauſe you were Rantiz'd, not Baptiz'd, Sprinkled, not dipped, or plunged all over in the Water; which, ſays he, is ſo neceſſary in the Act of Baptizing, that a Perſon may as well omit to baptize in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and Holy Ghoſt, as omit the Dipping the parly baptiz'd under the Water, which is the next part of the Controverſie between us and you. For the clearer underſtanding of which I ſhall do three things.

1. Lay down ſome general Propoſitions relating to this Controverſie.

2. Produce our Arguments which fully ſatisfy us, touching the Lawfulneſs of our way of baptizing without dipping.

3. Return an anſwer to what you offer in plea for the juſtifying your own Practice and condemning ours.

1. Ge-

1. General Propoſitions for the clearing of this Controverſie.

1. *Prop.* That we ought to diſtinguiſh betwixt that which is of the Eſſence of baptiſm, and that which only is accidental in baptiſm: The Word and the Element of Water are of the Eſſence of Baptiſm: *Accedat verbum ad Elementum, & fit Sacramentum:* ſays St. *Auſtin:* let the word of Inſtitution be added to the Water, and it becomes a Sacrament: but tho' Water be eſſential in baptiſm, yet the *modus applicandi*; that is, the manner of applying the Water to the perſon baptized, is only Circumſtantial: Some apply the Perſon to the Water, others apply the Water to the Perſon; both are warrantable, becauſe we have ſufficient reaſon to believe that baptiſm was Adminiſtred both ways by the firſt Adminiſtrators of it, as ſhall be made appear in its place.

2. *Prop.* That the way and manner of applying the Water in baptiſm is not poſitively determined in the Holy Scriptures, it cannot be gathered either from the ſignification of the word, or from the ſignificancy of the Ceremony, or from the Command of Chriſt. Not from the ſignification of the Original word, for that ſignifies to Waſh as well as to Dip. Not from the ſignificancy of the Ceremony: for the pouring out of Water on the Perſon baptized, is as ſignificative as the pouring out of the Blood of Chriſt, and the pouring forth the Spirit of Chriſt upon the Chriſtian, (which is the thing ſignified in baptiſm) as dipping can be: and farther we meet with no command from Chriſt to evince the neceſſity either of dipping or Sprinkling; we are required to baptize with Water, in the name of the Father, *&c.* But we find no Command either for the meaſure and quantity of the Water, or for the manner of applying the Water in Baptiſm, any more than we find for the quantity of bread, or the quality of Wine in the Lords Supper.

3. *Prop.* That as there is a probability that baptiſm was Adminiſtred in the Apoſtles times by immerſion or

Dipping, ſo there is likewiſe a probability that it was Adminiſtred by aſperſion or Sprinkling, if ſuch as were Baptized in *Jordan* and *Anon* were Baptized by Dipping, yet ſuch as were Baptized in their own Houſes, as St. *Paul*, *Act.* 9. 18, 19. And the Jaylor at midnight, and thoſe 3000. that were Baptized, *Act.* 2. On the Feaſt of *Pentecoſt*, before the Congregation then Aſſembled at *Jeruſalem*: Surely it is much more probable that theſe were Baptized by Sprinkling or pouring Water on the face; that repreſenting the whole Perſon: for the Dipping ſo many thouſands over Head and Ears in a River would have been a work of many days, which the Text tells us was done the ſame day, *Act.* 2. 41. So that the manner of applying the Water being not poſitively determined in Scripture, it ſeems probable enough that Baptiſm was and may be Adminiſtred either way, both by Dipping and Sprinkling.

4. *Prop.* That we do not oppoſe the Lawfulneſs of Dipping in ſome caſe, but the neceſſity of Dipping in all caſes. Our Church acknowledges the Lawfulneſs of Dipping, and in ſome caſes directs us to it, but ſhe does not account it ſo eſſential to Baptiſm as to enjoyn it in all caſes, without any reſpect had to times and perſons. For the change of ſuch a circumſtance being undetermined in the Word of God, is no change or Violation of the Original Inſtitution.

5. *Prop.* That none ought to put a Divine Inſtitution upon any Rite, at their own pleaſure, when it is in its own nature indifferent: and conſequently thoſe who lay ſuch a mighty ſtreſs upon Dipping, as to pronounce the Baptiſm of all the Reformed Churches throughout the World Null and Void without it, ought to prove it an unchangeable Rite intended by Chriſt to oblige and bind all Nations, all Perſons, and at all Times, and of ſuch indiſpenſable neceſſity that the Voluntary Omiſſion of it is a Sin: Now that Man muſt have a large ſhare of confidence that will aſſert this concerning Dipping.

6. *Prop.*

6. *Prop.* That in Sacraments it is not the quantity of Elements but the ſignificancy of them, that ought to be attended: In Circumciſion it was not the quantity of Fleſh cut off, ſo much as the ſignification of it, that the *Jews* were to concern themſelves about: So in the Lords Supper it is not the quantity of Bread and Wine, but the right apprehenſion of the thing ſignified, thereby that we ſhould labour after. Sure I am, that the Taſting and Eating of a little Bread, and Drinking a ſmall quantity of Wine does ſignifie to me my full Communion with Chriſt as well as the largeſt Banquet could do. Thus alſo in Baptiſm a few drops of Water pour'd upon me, may ſignify, Seal, conveigh and confirm to to me a right and intereſt in all the benefits of my Saviours Death and Reſurrection, as fully as if with *Jonah* I were plunged into the Main Ocean.

Theſe General propoſitions being laid down for the clearer underſtanding of this Water-controverſy, I proceed to produce thoſe arguments, which ſatisfy us touching the Lawfulneſs of our Adminiſtring Baptiſm without Dipping.

1. *Arg.* Such an application of Water in the Adminiſtration of Baptiſm, as the Spirit of God in Scripture expreſly calls Baptizing, is Lawful and ſufficient to be uſed in Baptiſm.

But ſprinkling or pouring Water upon the party Baptized, without Dipping, is by the Spirit of God in divers Scriptures, expreſly called a Baptizing.

Therefore it is Lawful and ſufficient, and Dipping not neceſſary. I ſhould not trouble this Auditory with the ſignification of the Original word, which we render to Baptize; Did not the *Anabaptiſts* confidently aſſert that it always ſignifies to Dip or Plunge a Perſon or thing wholly under Water, or at leaſt that Dipping or Plunging is the Primary ſignification of the Word, which is a great miſtake: For the Primitive word Βάπτω, (from whence comes Βαπτίζω) ſignifies to Dye, or give

a new Colour, a Metaphor taken from a Dyers Fat. And altho' I am not fond of Notions gather'd from Metaphorical expreſſions, I will adventure to ſay for once, that the Metaphor may ſerve not unfitly to remind us of our priviledge in Baptiſm, whereby our Souls are made receptive of a new Colour, by being imbued with the Tincture of that Faith which we are Baptized into. And as for the derivative word Βαπτίζω. Sometimes it ſignifies to Dip or Plung, ſometimes to Waſh or Cleanſe: Thus, *Heb.* 9. *v.* 10. we read of divers Waſhings under the Law. In the original, it is divers baptiſms. Now what were thoſe Waſhings but Sprinklings? Sometimes Blood was ſprinkled, ſometimes Water was poured forth, No perſons were Dipped or Plunged in Blood, yet thoſe Sprinklings are called Baptizings. Thus alſo in St *Mark* 7. *v.* 4. *The* Phariſees *Eat not except they Waſh.* In the Original it is, *Except they be Baptized.* Now the manner of Waſhing before Meat is ſufficiently known, not to be by Dipping, but by pouring Water; ſee 2 *Kings* 3. *v.* 11. *Eliſha poured water on the Hands of Eliſha:* We read alſo of their Baptiſms (or) Waſhings of Beds and Tables many times a day, which if done by dipping, beſides many other inconveniencies, would make the labour of the *Jews* intolerable, and the burthen inſupportable. If then the word (Baptize) be a word of Latitude and large ſignification: If it ſignifies as well to Sprinkle and Waſh, as to Plung and Dip, then for you to build an Article of Faith upon the ſignification of that word, and to condemn our Baptiſm as Null and Void, when the ſubject Baptized is Waſhed, tho' not Dip'd and Plung'd, is unreaſonably weak, and to all Wiſe Men utterly unconvincing.

2. *Arg.* Againſt Dipping. If Baptiſm adminiſtred by pouring Water on the Face, (repreſenting the whole perſon) doth anſwer the Uſe and End of Baptiſm, as well as when adminiſtred by dipping and plunging. Then dipping is not eſſentially and abſolutely neceſſary

in

in the act of Baptizing. But the one anſwers the Uſe and End of Baptiſm as well as the other. Therefore the one cannot be more neceſſary than the other. What is the Uſe and End of Baptiſm but to repreſent to our minds the effuſion of Chriſt's Blood for the taking away the Guilt of Sin, and the pouring forth of the Holy Spirit, for the purging away the Filth of it? Now the Sprinkling of the Blood of Chriſt, and the pouring forth of his Holy Spirit upon the Infant, are more fully and plainly repreſented by Baptiſm, as adminiſtred by Sprinkling than by Dipping. For thus I Argue:

If the Inward and Spiritual Grace ſignified by Baptiſm, be more lively repreſented by Sprinkling, than by Dipping: Then ſurely Sprinkling is not only as Lawful, but more expedient than Dipping;

But the Inward and Spiritual Grace ſignified by Baptiſm, to wit, the cleanſing of the Soul by the Grace and Spirit of Chriſt, is more lively repreſented by Sprinkling than by Dipping. Therefore more expedient, and accordingly we find Almighty God himſelf, often expreſſing that mercy of Sanctification by this action, *Ezek.* 36. 25. *Then will I Sprinkle clean Water upon you, and ye ſhall be clean, &c.*

3. *Arg.* If dipping were eſſentially and abſolutely neceſſary in baptiſm, then in all the baptiſms recorded in Scripture, we ſhould meet with full proof, or at leaſt with fair probability, that the parties baptized were all dipped. But in ſeveral inſtances of Baptized perſons Recorded in Scripture, we meet with no ſuch Proof, nor yet with any probability of their being dipped, when they were baptized, but the contrary. Therefore ſurely, dipping cannot be ſo eſſential to baptiſm, as for want of it, to pronounce the baptiſm of all the Reformed Churches throughout the the World to be Null and Void.

Obſerve a few inſtances in the New Teſtament.

1. Take notice of St. *Pauls* baptiſm by *Ananias*, *Acts* 9. *v.* 18, 19. *He aroſe and was Baptized; and when he had*

had received Meat, he was strengthened: Read the context, and you will be convinced that he was Baptized in his Lodgings, being Sick and Weak, having Fasted three Whole Dayes; now being in this low condition, partly by his Miraculous Vision, and partly by his extraordinary fasting, I appeal to you, whether it be probable to conceive that *Ananias* carried him out to a River in that condition to plunge him in cold Water.

2. Observe the instance of the Jaylor, *Acts* 16. 33. *And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes, and was Baptized, he and all his straightway.* That St. *Paul*, who was newly washed of his Sores occasioned by his Stripes, should carry the Jaylor and all his in the Dead of the Night, out to a River or Pond to Baptize them, is only to be believed, by such as have their credulity at their own dispose, and can believe what they list.

3. We read, *Acts* 2. 41. of three thousand Baptized in one day, in the same place where they heard St. *Peters* Sermon which Converted them: This place the Text tells us was *Jerusalem*, and must be either the Temple, or some House, or in a Street, where such quantities of Water could not be found, as might serve for the decent Dipping of so many thousands in so short a time, and besides, that Baptizing so many by Dipping, would have required a Week rather than a Day to dispatch it in.

4. *Arg.* Against the necessity of Dipping, is thus: If Baptism be an Institution prescribed to all Nations, then its manner of Administration being common to all must be possible to all, but Baptism cannot be Administred in some Countries by Dipping. 1. In regard of the difficulty of the thing; Some Countryes scarce having Water enough to drink, not a River, nor a Brook in many miles compass. 2. In regard of the danger of the thing; For doubtless our Saviour, who prefers mercy before Sacrifice, allows the Administration of the Ordi-

nance

nance in ſuch a way as is conſiſtent with his Peoples lives, which muſt in ſome Countryes eſpecially at ſome ſeaſons of the year, be in extreme danger by dipping: None at all, (ſays you in your Letter to me) for the preſence of God can make the cold water hot: who queſtions his power, ſay I, but where is his promiſe? Why, ſay you, in *Iſa.* 43. 2. *When thou paſſeſt thorow the Waters, I will be with thee.* (Good God, was there ever ſuch an ignorant wreſting the Scriptures, ſince they were firſt Written, as at this day is made by theſe Lay-Preachers:) But whether you will believe or not, that Dipping in the Nothern Countryes will endanger Life, I am better ſatisfied, than if I experienced it, by reading an Act made by the Senate at *Zurich* in *Zwitzerland*, that if an *Anabaptiſt* Dip any of their People, he ſhould be puniſh'd with Drowning.

5. *Arg.* Whatſoever has a tendency towards the breach of the ſixth and ſeventh Commandment by endangering our Own or our Neighbours Life, Health or Chaſtity, is not ſafe, but ſinful.

But Baptiſm by dipping as Adminiſtred by ſome Perſons, and in ſome places may expoſe all theſe to hazard: Therefore it is not ſafe, but ſinful. How many thouſand perſons Strong and Weak, Old and Young, would this plunging over Head and Ears in Nothern Countries, and in the Winter ſeaſon infallibly deſtroy and make an end of?

Whereas Almighty God is very tender over the Life of Man, he would not have the *Jewiſh* Infants Circumciſed before the eighth day, leſt they had not ſufficient ſtrength to bear it: and ſurely he is not leſs merciful to the ſeed of his people now, than he was under the Law. What a burthen was Circumciſion accounted before it was removed? But verily you go about to ſubſtitute as heavy a burthen in the room of it, nay heavier, for Circumciſion put one part of the Body to pain, but your Dipping affects the whole body. Now therefore, why

tempt

tempt you God, by putting a Yoak of servitude upon the neck of Christs Free-men, which neither they nor their Children are able to bear.

Farther, this practice of yours endangers your own, and your Neighbours Chastity. For either you dip the person naked, or cloathed; if cloathed, by what authority do you baptize the cloaths, together with the person? If naked, or next to naked, what unclean thoughts and filthy desires may this Occasion, if not in the Actors, yet at least in the gazing Spectators? Whereas all the Ordinances of God ought to be performed with that gravity and modesty, with that shamefacedness and Sobriety, as may extort a Veneration from all beholders, and not prostitute them to contempt and scorn.

Obj. But say you, in your Letter to Me, What Immodesty was in *Lydia* and other women in Scripture, who, as we believe, were baptized by dipping?

Answ. Prove it positively that they were dipt if you can, and then I will Answer you, that that may be Lawful and modest in own Country, which is sinful and immodest in another. In some Hot Countries it is no immodesty to go Naked, but he that shall do so in *England*, will be accounted an immodest beast. In *Boaz* his Country it was no immodesty in *Ruth* to come behind him, uncover his Feet, and lye down by him; but should a young Maid serve you so, if you are a modest man, you would certainly account her a Whore for so doing.

6. *Arg.* That Ordinance, and that way of Administration which Almighty God has honoured and blest to the benefit and advantage of many thousands of his Children and People, ought not to be accounted either sinfully Administred, or invalid in the Administration.

But the Administration of baptism without dipping, has Almighty God highly honoured, and signally blest, to the comfort and advantage of multitudes of his Servants, many of whom are yet alive, and many more rejoyce in Heaven, for the benefit and comfort of their Bap-

Baptiſm, tho' never Dipt: Therefore what preſumptive raſhneſs is it in you, to pronounce the Ordinance of baptiſm thus Adminiſtred and thus bleſt, to be Null and Void?

Having thus produced the Arguments for the Lawfulneſs of our way of Adminiſtring Baptiſm: I come next to conſider your way of Adminiſtration, and to examine, whether your Arguments for Dipping will hold Water.

Your common Pleas are,

1. Plea, the word (Baptize) in Scripture, ſay you, always ſignifies to Dip, when applyed to the Ordinance of Baptiſm.

Not always (ſays we) but oft-times ſignifies Waſhing and Sprinkling, as was largely ſhewn even now, and plainly appears from 1 *Cor.* 10. 1. *They were all Baptized in the Cloud.* This could be no other than by ſprinkling, for they could not be Dipt in the Cloud.

Obj. Oh! but ſay you, this was no real Baptiſm, but Typical only and extraordinary.

Anſw. It was real baptiſm, for *Moſes* Baptiſm and Chriſt's differ'd not in ſubſtance, the *Iſraelites* baptiſm was a *Prodomus* and fore-runner of our baptiſm, but be it as it will: this inſtance ſhews and confutes you that the word baptize doth not always ſignifie to Dip.

Obj. But ſay you, the *Dutch Annotators* thus render the word (baptize) to doop or Dip, and for *John* the *Baptiſt* they read *John* the *Dooper*. Therefore, &c.

Anſw. Very well: and ſuppoſe our *Engliſh Annotators* had rendred it *John* the *Sprinkler*, as the *Dutch* have rendred it *John* the *Dipper*, had not the Argument been the ſame? What a mighty impertinency is this, to lay ſo much ſtreſs upon the ſignification of a word which is taken in ſeveral ſenſes, as the great Maſters of the Greek Tongue have abundantly proved?

2. Plea: But baptiſm, ſay you, ſignifies the Death and Burial of Chriſt; now *Dipping* is a more lively repreſentation of Chriſts Death, for thereby the party baptized is

received into the bosom of the Water, as our Saviour was into the bosom of the Earth.

Ans. Baptism may signifie the Death of Christ, and be so administred as lively to represent the death of our Saviour, without exposing those who are Baptized to the danger of death, and may signifie Christs burial too; without sending the baptized person to his Grave. Even in sprinkling, there is a plain Representation of Christs death, for the pouring forth of the Water not unfitly represents the pouring forth the Earth upon a dead body; but if you will closely follow the metaphor of burial in all particulars: Then as the person buried is altogether passive, and laid in the Grave only by others, in like manner, the party baptized ought to put neither Foot, nor Leg, nor Thigh into the Water himself, but the Dipper ought to take him up in his Arms, and lay his intire body into the water, as a Man is laid into his Grave; the persons whom you pretend to Baptize, go into the water near the Waste; now so far as they go in of themselves, they baptize themselves; why do you not keep close to the Metaphor of burying, and lay them down intirely into the bosom of the water. I confess I have heard of some of you, that have kept closer to this Metaphor of Burial; and have kept the Baptized persons so long under water, that they have been almost choaked and buried alive; so that by this you see, what little reason you have to make such an outcry against us, for baptizing only a part of the body instead of the whole; it is very plain you do the same your selves, you baptize only from the waste upward, all the lower part is put under water by themselves, not by you: *Thou that judgest another condemnest thy self*, inasmuch as thou dost the same thing.

3. Plea: Our blessed Saviour, say you, was Baptized at thirty years of Age, and then by Dipping: *For he went up out of the Water*, St. *Mat.* 3. 16. and shall not we imitate our dear Saviours Example?

Answ.

Anſw. Yes, in all things wherein he has commanded you to follow it. Remember that Chriſt was circumciſed at eight days old in his Infancy, and altho he was not Baptized in his Infancy, yet was he Baptized in the Infancy of Baptiſm: Our Saviour being very early Baptized of St. *John*, after he entred upon that Office; as for the manner of our Saviours Baptiſm we have no certainty, for his going up out of the water is expounded by ſome, of the Scituation of the River *Jordan*, which was beneath the place where St. *John* was teaching; but ſuppoſe that our Saviour did go down into the water, and was Baptized by Immerſion, where has he commmanded you to go into Water, becauſe he did; an Example without a Precept, eſpecially in an extraordinary Perſon, and in an extraordinary Caſe, as our Saviours was, is not binding.

4. Plea. But *John* Baptized in *Ænon*, becauſe there was much water there, and *Philip* went down with the Eunuch into the water, therefore dipping was the way then.

1. *Anſw.* As for St. *Johns* baptizing in *Ænon*, *Joh.* 3.23. Let the Original be conſidered: and it is not, *there was* πόλυ ὕδωρ, *much Water*, *but* πολλὰ ὕδατα: *many waters*: that is, many Streams or Rivulets of water there, and *Sandy*'s Travails tell us, that they were ſo ſhallow as not to reach above the Ankles; ſo that the ſmall quantity of water would hardly admit of baptiſm by dipping.

2. But ſuppoſe they did baptize by dipping then, when there was neither danger nor indecency; yet it doth not follow that all Nations muſt do the ſame, and that at all times; unleſs (1.) Practice and Example be a ſufficient ground for the Inſtitution of a Sacramental Rite. (2.) Unleſs it can be proved that every circumſtance belonging to a Sacrament is of an unchangeable and unalterable Nature, and ſo neceſſary that it may not in any Caſe be altered without ſin. Both which will appear *ad Græcas calendas*. Having now diſpatcht

the Controversial; I come in the last place to the Practical part of this Discourse.

1. All you that are pious Parents, Bless God for this Birth-priviledge; and be not wrangled out of it, own it as an invaluable favour that Almighty God has taken your Children into Covenant with Himself, together with your selves; when you dedicate your Children to God in baptism, God Seals unto them presently, their Names are put into the Deed; and during their Infancy Christ the Mediator of the Covenant is surety for them: If when they grow up, they dislike their Master and turn Renegado's, it is neither Gods fault, nor thine, if they be cast out of Covenant, nay cast into Hell; what low and contemptible thoughts soever some men have of this Birth-priviledge, I dare appeal to the tender Bowels of any Christian Parent, whether he would not sooner part with his Children into Captivity, and chose rather to see them Gally-slaves in *Turkey*, and at the same time in Covenant with God; than to enjoy them in his Arms, and not have them Members of Christs Body. Yea I will add, that it would be a much less Sorrow to a pious Parent, to see his Children dasht against the Stones, and yet to die under Christs Wing, as Visible Members of his Body; then to have them live all their days in his sight, having no other than a visible standing in the devils Kingdom.

It is not meet says our Saviour, To take Childrens Bread, and cast it unto Dogs: Baptism is the Bread of the Lord, which he would have given to his Children: God Almighty then forgive those men, who make the Infant Seed of Believers no better than Dogs; and pronounce them as uncapable of benefit by Baptism as unreasonable Creatures, and declare it to be as lawful to Christen a Bell as to Baptize a Child; that when it rains, if a Parent bring his Child into the open Air, and let the Cloud sprinkle it; it is as effectual as if the Priest Baptiz'd it. Verily the day is hastning, when a severe

ſevere account muſt be given by theſe men, for all the hard ſpeeches they have uttered againſt the Innocent Lambs in Chriſts Flock, for which the great Shepherd died. As for you that hear me this day, if you love your ſelves and your Children in your ſelves, ſtand up in the defence of your Childrens *Magna Charta*, in oppoſition to all thoſe that will bring their *Quo Warranto* againſt it; and verily when I conſider what an invaluable Priviledge the Covenant-Bleſſing is, I cannot but wonder that any pious Parent who is withal Judicious; ſhould ſuffer himſelf to be Bubbl'd out of it. But eſpecially I admire, how it comes to paſs that you that are Mothers, who have naturally ſuch a ſtrong Affection to your Innocent Babes, ſhould yet be in Love with this ſower Opinion, which not only ſets your Children in their Infancy, in no better State than Pagans and Infidels, but ranks them amongſt dogs and ſwine, as to their incapacity of receiving any benefit by baptiſm: But I eaſily anſwer my ſelf thus, that Women thro' the weakneſs of their underſtandings, do not apprehend the Conſequences of this Opinion; and ſo they maintain the hopes of their Childrens Salvation, whilſt they deſtroy the grounds of it; which is indeed right Womens Logick, to hold the Concluſion, and yet deny the premiſes; that is, to believe that their Children are ſaved, and yet deny that they are in Covenant with God, which is the great ground of hope for their Salvation.

2. Let me exhort all you that are Parents, or may be ſuch, to take ſpecial care that you conſcientiouſly diſcharge your duty to your Children, as you will anſwer the contrary at the barr of God; and that you may do ſo, know

1. Something is to be done for them before they are born.

2. Something as ſoon as they are born.

3. Something as ſoon as they come to years of underſtanding.

1. Before your Children are born, (1.) Make ſure as much as in you lieth, that they may be born within the Covenant, and under the Promiſe, by your being in Covenant with God your ſelves; ſee that the Lord be your God, a God in Covenant with you; and then you may comfortably hope that he will be the God of your ſeed, in their Generations; Oh were but Infants capable of Knowledge, how much would they dread being born of wicked Parents, that live in open Rebellion againſt God, it matters not what Planet, but what Promiſe your Children are born under; if they be born under the Promiſe, you may look upon them as a hopeful ſeed. Farther (2.) Make it your endeavour before your Children are born, to ſanctifie your Children: This is done by Prayer and Thankſgiving, Children are not only capable of a bleſſing as ſoon as they are born, but they ought to be bleſſed by their Parents before they are born. 1. By Bleſſing God for the hopes of them; and 2*d*. By commending them by Prayer unto his bleſſing.

2. As ſoon your Children are born, preſent them to the Lord, Dedicate and devote them to the ſervice of their Maker in the Ordinance of baptiſm; and do this preſently, joyfully, and publickly: (1.) Dedicate your Children to God in baptiſm ſpeedily; do not unneceſſarily delay it; for thereby you will implicitely deny God the Title, which by Vertue of the Covenant he has to your ſeed, as ſoon as ever they are yours; nay farther, upon ſuch delay you have great reaſon to fear, leſt God ſhould be angry with you, as he was with *Moſes* for delaying to Circumciſe his Child; and leſt you ſhould be in as much danger, as he was alſo: *When the Angel of the Lord met him in the way, and ſought to kill him*, Exod. 4. 24. Again, (2.) Dedicate your Childdren

dren to God joyfully, looking upon the day of their baptiſm as the day of their eſpouſal to Chriſt, as the day of their Admiſſion into his Family, and conſequently a day of greater Joy than their Marriage-day to the Mightieſt Monarchs upon Earth; and with much greater Thankfulneſs to be celebrated. (3.) Make uſe of a publick opportunity to do this in; do not huddle up your Childrens baptiſm in private, but give them up to God in the Face of the Congregation, partly, that by the Prayers of many, the incomes of the Ordinance may be the more Plentiful; and partly, that the Ratification of the engagement may be the more ſolemn.

In a Word, ſhall the oppoſers of Infant baptiſm, creep out of darkneſs and private Corners, and in the Face of the Country, ſcandalouſly dip their deluded Proſelytes at Noon-day; and ſhall we, who do that which is a joyful Spectacle to Holy Angels and good men, decline the Light, as if it were a deed of darkneſs: God forbid? Let us not ſeek Corners to baptize our Infants in, whilſt we need not, leſt God juſtly permit the Enemies of the Truth to prevail ſo far, as to force us into Corners when we would not.

3. As ſoon as your Children are capable of Underſtanding: Endeavour to make them ſenſible of their baptiſmal Dedication and Engagements, and that they begin early to walk ſuitably thereunto. What's the reaſon ſo little fruit appears of this Advantageous and Soul-engaging Ordinance of baptiſm in the lives of Children? is it not too often from the Parents neglect? We read, that when Almighty God was offended with *Moſes* for neglecting to Circumciſe his Child; his Wife *Zipporah* in a Paſſion threw the Childs Foreskin at him, ſaying, *A Bloody Husband haſt thou been unto me:* Oh! How many Children another day, will throw the very Coals of Hell at their Parents Heads, and ſay, A Bloody Father, or a Bloody Mother have you

been unto me, you laid me under an Oath and Vow to God in my baptiſm, but you took no care to acquaint me with the Nature of that Obligation. Oh Cruel Parent, that never put up Prayer for me, that never dropt Tear over me, that never gave any word of ſpiritual Counſel or Soul-Advice unto me. Oh what a Terrour will it be unto you, to hear your Children give a judicial Teſtimony againſt you in the day of your Account. Therefore to prevent this, begin early to inſtruct your Children in the Fundamental Principles of Religion, by a Familiar Catechiſing of them. Youth is ſoft and pliable, and may be bended to our purpoſes; when your Children are Young, they are moſt in your Power, and you have then the greateſt command of them: But eſpecially then they have not acquired ſuch ill and vitious habits, nor imbibed ſuch falſe Principles and Notices of Things, as they will do afterwards, if the opportunity of Youth be neglected.

Sow then the ſeeds of good Inſtruction in the Morning of your Childrens Youth, before the Enemy ſows his Tares. They will be liſping out of Oaths, as ſoon as Words; if you do not teach them to uſe their Tongues aright, and be ſure you inſtruct them in the Principles of our common Chriſtianity, not in the Notions and Private Opinions of a Sect, or Party. 'Tis very eaſie to Proſelyte young Ones to a Faction, and to Eſpouſe them to ſome narrow and ſtingy Opinions: to beget in them an eſteem of a particular Party of Men, and to learn them to ſcorn and deſpiſe all the World beſides.

Whereas the Principles of real Chriſtianity will oblige them to the Love and Practice of Univerſal Benignity and Kindneſs: *Train up therefore a Child in the way wherein it ſhould go, and when it is old it will not depart from it.*

And

And here I cannot but ſadly taken notice, how ſuch as account it to no purpoſe to baptize their Children, do conclude it to be of as little uſe to Catechiſe them; and therefore they decry and inveigh againſt our Practice of teaching Children the Lords-prayer and Ten Commandments, as breeding them up in a form of Godlineſs, and cauſing them to take Gods Holy and Reverend name in vain. I wiſh that ſuch would conſider, how good Chriſtians in all Ages have laboured to ſeaſon the Underſtandings of little Ones with the Principles of Chriſtianity; did not *Timothies* Grand-mother and Mother teach him the Scriptures from a Sucking Child, 2 *Tim.* 3. 15. Alas the rooms of your Childrens Souls will not be long unfurniſht; the Devil, the World, and the Fleſh, will make an early offer, and engage them betimes, and if you begin not early with your Children, you will be foreſtall'd, and find the work much more difficult; for, 'tis eaſier to keep the ſtrong man out, than to turn him out.

In the next place, let me exhort all Perſons here preſent, Parents and Children, Young and Old, to a double Duty. Often reflect upon your baptiſm; but think it not ſufficient to Salvation that you are baptized.

1. Reflect often upon your own baptiſm, upon every Solemn occaſion, when you ſee another preſented to baptiſm, remember your own, and call to mind the obligation you lye under, to Die to Sin and to Live unto God, the ſerious reflection upon baptiſm in the Perſon of another may be more effectual than if Adminiſtred over again to thee in thine own Perſon. God ſpeaks that to thee in the Perſon of the Infant, which once he ſpake to thy ſelf, when thou wert baptized; and remember that your Baptiſmal engagements which you took upon you many years ago, lye as firmly upon you, as the Childs, which were made this day be-

fore your face: in short, let it be your great care and your chief concern, that whilst others erroneously disown their Baptism, you do not practically deny yours, but labour to walk suitably to your baptismal engagements. Live as those that are Redeemed by the Blood of Jesus; as those that are Sanctified and Sealed by the Spirit of Jesus; as those that do expect an eternal fellowship and Communion with Jesus in his Heavenly Kingdom.

2. Think it not sufficient to Salvation that you have been baptized. Set not up your rest there, without a Conversation in all things agreeable thereunto: Oh! know that a Man may go to Hell with the Baptismal Water on his Face, and the Sacramental Cup in his Hand, if he does not Live answerable to his engagements! for the higher the Priviledge, the heavier the Guilt: Verily an un-baptized Heathen at the great Day will not change places with many baptized Christians: Oh, Beg of God then, that you may be born of the Spirit, as well as born of Water; that as you are baptized into Christ, you may put on Christ; that is, partake of his Holy Nature, and imitate his Holy Life: In a word, pray that you may be Baptized with the Holy Ghost, and with Fire: that is, be made partakers of the Sanctifying Graces of the Holy Spirit, whose Operation is like Fire, burning up the Dregs of our Lusts, and the Dross of our Corruptions.

Lastly, I shall subjoyn a word of Friendly Admonition to you, who have assumed to your self the Authority of a publick Teacher in this Place, who have crept in here, and widened a breach amongst this People, who were lately a most United Body: and are daily endeavouring to divide them more and more, by perswading them to renounce their first Dedication to God in Baptism, and to enter into your Communion after the way of Dipping. I solemnly profess I bare no ill will unto your

your Perſon: But I really pitty you as a Perſon miſled by the prejudices of Education, and miſleading others, by undertaking an Office (to get Bread I fear which you are no way qualified for, as appears partly by your own confeſſion, and more fully by your Letter Written to me, which alas, is ſo far from containing any thing of Arguments, that it wants common ſenſe. I ſpeak not this to ſhame you, but in real Charity I warn you, to Learn before you undertake to Teach: or if you muſt be at Teaching, re-aſſume your late profeſſion of Teaching Children to Read, and pretend not to be an Inſtructer of Men of Underſtanding. By this time, I hope you ſee juſt cauſe of bluſhing at your own Ignorance and raſhneſs in Condemning the Doctrine and practice of the Church of *England*, (and therein of all the Reformed Churches) with reference to Infant Baptiſm, as Erroneous and Scriptureleſs. This was the charge given in your Letter, and how you have defended and made good the Charge, I had rather the Auditory ſhould tell you than my ſelf.

After all the pains I have here taken, I have but ſmall hopes of ſeeing your new Proſelytes (which you have ſtolen from us) Re-baptized into our Principles, (for an hundred are ſooner miſled than ten recovered) but if I can for the future prevent our Peoples being dipt into your Opinions, I have what I aim'd at: and if what I have now delivered be ſo far influenced by the Divine Bleſſing, as to contribute ſomething towards the eſtabliſhment of any one Soul whom you have endeavoured to unſettle, I ſhall for ever Bleſs Almighty God for the honor he has put upon me, and account my preſent pains abundantly compenſated.

As to your ſelf and thoſe whom you have perverted, my Prayer ſhall be to Almighty God to guide you by his

his Word and Spirit into all Truth; to reduce yo into the Communion of our Church, in which a things necessary to your Salvation are enjoyed, and t preserve and persevere you therein to his Heavenly Kin dom. And for my self and the chief body of this Peop here assembled, may Almighty God keep us stedfast i his Truth, edifie and build us up in Grace and Know ledge; and may the God of Peace, which brought aga from the Dead our Lord Jesus Christ, the great Shep herd of his Sheep, make us perfect in every good Wor to do his Will. Now brethren I commend you to Go and to the Word of his Grace, which is able to bui you up and to give an Inheritance amongst them tha are Sanctified. *Amen.*

FINIS.